WITHDRAWN

Hurst Memorial Library

Pacific Christian College

2500 E. Nutwood Ave.
Fullerton, CA 92631

2.9 Grandmaison
54j Jesus Christ
1

93

~~Anna L. Kershner~~
~~11 Maplewood Court~~
~~Indianapolis~~
~~Indiana~~

HURST MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Pacific Christian College
2500 E. Nutwood
Fullerton, CA 92631

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/jesuschrist0001leon

# JESUS CHRIST

VOL. I

AUTHORISED TRANSLATION BY

DOM BASIL WHELAN

*Monk of Belmont*

# JESUS CHRIST

## *HIS PERSON—HIS MESSAGE HIS CREDENTIALS*

BY

LÉONCE DE GRANDMAISON, S.J.

*VOLUME I*

HURST MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Pacific Christian College
2500 E. Nutwood
Fullerton, CA 92631

*NEW YORK*
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1930

NIHIL OBSTAT: DOM STEPHEN MARRON, O.S.B.
CONGREG. CENSOR
IMPRIMATURE: W. E. KELLY, O.S.B.
ABBAS PRAESES
NIHIL OBSTAT: EDUARDUS J. MAHONEY S.T.D.
CENSOR DEPUTATUS
IMPRIMATUR: EDM. CAN. SURMONT,
VIC. GEN.
WESTMONASTERII, DIE IIA IUNII, MCMXXX

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

30493

232.9
G754j
V. 1

# FOREWORD

The book now before the reader is the fruit of the labour of a whole lifetime.

Before he was yet twenty years old, and while he was still a novice, Père de Grandmaison had already marked out the main lines of the apologetic work which he dreamed of writing. In 1899, when he was thirty years old, he was entrusted with the task of teaching fundamental theology to the scholastics of the Society of Jesus, first at Lyons, then at Canterbury, and finally at Hastings. His work treated chiefly of the mission and the Person of Jesus Christ.

During these years of teaching the book was sketched out, and it was taken in hand by Père de Grandmaison during the twenty years of his ministry in Paris (1908-1927). There, as director of *Etudes*, founder and director of *Récherches de Science Religieuse*, lecturer, confessor, and preacher, he was absorbed in a thousand labours; but he devoted his scanty leisure and especially his vacation months to the completion of his book. In 1914 he published his article *Jésus Christ* in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique ;* but this article, which ran to nearly three hundred columns, was but a sketch. In January, 1927, the present work was finished, but Père de Grandmaison had not the joy of seeing it appear. Prematurely worn out by the numerous undertakings on which he had lavished his powers, he died on 15 June, 1927.

The work has appeared precisely as the author conceived and wrote it. We have contented ourselves with adding here and there a few very brief notes adding fresh bibliographical information or indicating a new aspect of the discussion. These notes are placed between square brackets [1]. Père J. Huby, who, with us, had read the book in manuscript during the author's lifetime, has greatly assisted us in preparing it for the press. With the help of some of his scholars he undertook the correction of the proofs and the drawing up of the tables. We are happy to have the opportunity of thanking him here for his fraternal collaboration.

JULES LEBRETON.

---

[1] A few additions to the notes have also been made for this English translation, and these are also placed in square brackets, but may be distinguished by the sign " —Tr." which follows them. (Eng. Tr.).

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

*APOT:* The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. (R. H. Charles). Oxford, 1913.
*BS:* Bulletin Scientifique, Paris.
*CB:* (Corpus Berolinense). Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. (Berlin Academy.)
*CV:* Corpus (Vindobonense) scriptorum ecclesiasticorum. (Vienna Academy.)
*DACH:* Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. (J. Hastings.)
*DACL:* Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie. (Dom Cabrol.)
*DAFC:* Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique. (A. D'Ales.)
*DAGR:* Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. (Daremberg-Saglio-Pottier.)
*DBH:* Dictionary of the Bible. (J. Hastings.)
*DBV:* Dictionnaire de la Bible. (F. Vigouroux.)
*DBVS:* Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible de Vigouroux. (L. Pirot.)
*DCG:* Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. (J. Hastings.)
*DHGE:* Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie écclesiastique. (Baudrillart-Vogt-Rouzies.)
*DTC:* Dictionnaire de théologie catholique (Vacant-Mangenot-Amann.)
*EB:* Encyclopaedia Biblica. (Cheyne-Black.)
*EI:* Encyclopédie de l'Islam. (Houtsma-Basset.)
*ERE:* Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. (J. Hastings.)
*ESR:* Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses. (E. Lichtenberger.)
*GJV:* Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. (E. Schürer), 4th Edition.
*KGG:* Die Kultur der Gegenwart. (P. Hinneberg.)
*KTM:* Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. (Strack-Billerbeck.)
*JE:* The Jewish Encyclopedia. (J. Singer.) New York, 1904 onwards.
*JTS:* The Journal of Theological Studies, London.
*LGRM:* Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. (W. H. Roscher.)
*MG:* Patrologia Graeca. (Migne.)
*ML:* Patrologia Latina. (Migne.)
*RAM:* Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique, Toulouse.
*RB:* Revue Biblique, Paris.
*RECA:* Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. (Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll.)
*REJ:* Revue des Etudes juives, Paris.
*REP:* Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3rd Edition. (Herzog-Hauck.)
*RGG:* Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 1st Edition. (Gunkel-Zscharnack.)
*RHLR:* Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses, Paris.

*RHR:* Revue de l'histoire des religions, Paris.
*RSR:* Recherches de science religieuse, Paris.
*RVV:* Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. (Dieterich-Wünsch-Deubner.)
*SBA:* Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, Berlin.
*TS:* Texts and Studies. (J. A. Robinson.)
*TU:* Texte und Untersuchungen. (Gebhard-Harnack-Schmidt.)
*VGT:* The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. (Moulton-Milligan.)
*ZKT:* Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, Innsbruck.
*ZNTW:* Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen.

# CONTENTS

PAGE
Foreword . . . . . . . . . . v
List of Abbreviations . . . . . . vii

## BOOK I

## THE SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF JESUS

Preliminaries . . . . . . . . . 3

CHAPTER I. THE NON-CHRISTIAN SOURCES 7
  I. Jewish Sources . . . . . . . . 8
  II. Pagan Sources . . . . . . . . 13

CHAPTER II. THE CHRISTIAN SOURCES

  I. Non-Canonical Sources . . . . . . 17
  II. Canonical Sources . . . . . . . 20
    A. St. Paul . . . . . . . . 21
    B. The Gospels . . . . . . . 35
    C. The Literary Character of our Gospels . 39
    D. The Synoptic Gospels . . . . . 56
      1. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW . 57
      2. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK . 67
      3. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE . 77
      4. THE SYNOPTIC FACT AND THE PROBLEM . 91
      5. THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS . . . . . . 117

PAGE

E. The Fourth Gospel . . . . . . 125
  1. TRADITION . . . . . . 130
  2. THE SUPPORT FOR TRADITION IN THE GOSPEL 141
  3. THE LITERARY UNITY AND THE CHARACTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL . . . 155
  4. THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL . . . . . . 172
  CONCLUSION . . . . . . 183

NOTES:

A. Josephus and Primitive Christianity . . 190
B. The Creative Community . . . . 196
C. The Rhythms of the Oral Style in the New Testament . . . . . . 203
D. The Gospel according to the Hebrews . 214
E. The Value of the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Hebrews as Sources of History 221
F. The Argument from Style for the Unity of the Acts . . . . . . 225
G. St. Irenaeus on the Date and the Composition of the Gospels . . . . 228
H. The Beloved Disciple in Delff's Hypothesis 234
I. The Apocalypse of John the Prophet and the Gospel of John the Disciple . . 237

## *BOOK II*

## THE GOSPEL SETTING

Introduction . . . . . . . . 251

I. The Political Condition of the Jewish World . 253
II. The Social Setting . . . . . . 262
III. The Intellectual Setting . . . . . 276
  A. The Sources . . . . . . 276
  B. The Dominant Ideas . . . . . 280
IV. The Religious Setting and Foreign Infiltrations 292

PAGE

NOTE:

J. Saddducees and Pharisees . . . . . . 301

Bibliography . . . . . . . . 305
General Index . . . . . . . . 309
Index of Names . . . . . . . . 312

# BOOK I

# THE SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF JESUS

# PRELIMINARIES

Unlike Buddha Sakyamuni, Jesus did not come into the world during a period half-unknown, in which history and legend dispute over names and facts ; nor was he born, like Mahomet, in a remote district of Arabia. The Jewish world of the first century, particularly the Palestinian world, is well known to us ; its national vicissitudes, its complex political system, the flow of ideas and influences within its borders, all are in the full light of history. Its immediate surroundings, too, are an integral part of ancient civilisation in one of the most brilliant and best-known periods. To the old texts, which are somewhat literary in character, have been added in recent years the thousands of intimate writings which the sands of Egypt have yielded up to us. And at the same time, and in almost equal measure, archæological knowledge grows by reason of the methodical exploration carried out by the Schools and the scientific missions which have divided amongst themselves Greece (both continental and insular), Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and Persia.

Born under the rule of Augustus, and dying under that of Tiberius, Jesus was the contemporary of Philo the Jew, of Titus Livius, and of Seneca the Philosopher. Virgil, if he had lived to the normal age, might have seen him, while Nero, Flavius Josephus, Plutarch, and Tacitus belonged to the generation which immediately followed him.

Many others are well known to us amongst those who figure in the history of the origins of Christianity. The high priests Annas and Caiphas, the rabbi Gamaliel (the former master of St. Paul) ; Herod the Great, his son Herod Antipas, his grandson and great-grandson, Herod Agrippa I and II ;

Pontius Pilate and all those who, before and after the fleeting rule of Herod Agrippa I (41–44), succeeded him in the office of procurator of Judaea. So, too, we know intimately Gallio, the brother of Seneca, Proconsul of Achaia in 51–52 ; John the Baptist, and his disciples Simon Peter and John ; James of Jerusalem and Paul of Tarsus ; and many other personages whose activities are manifested to us by a multitude of concordant witnesses.

The person and the work of Christ thus fit in, in their own time, with the working out of a historical plan the continuity of which is proved. There is nothing of the nature of a vague figure about him, nothing of the mythical or legendary type, as in the case of an Orpheus, an Attis, or a Krishna. Jesus is a real man whose public appearance is firmly dated by means of an impressive synchronism : "Now in the fifteenth year the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip his brother tetrarch of Iturea and the country of Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilina, under the high priests Annas and Caiphas, the word of the Lord was made unto John, the son of Zachary, in the desert . . ."[1]

On the Master thus located many texts speak to us, offering us, together with the geography, the religions, the institutions, the literature and the customs of a definite period, innumerable details. A compact group of the faithful, many of them powerful in speech and in works, give themselves to him unconditionally, openly professing that only by him do they go to God ; and a whole world of particular beliefs, and a liturgical cult gifted with a prodigious force of expansion, has reference solely to him. Now between this spiritual blossoming and the God whom it proclaims, not as an ideal or a symbol, but as a living person and as a fact, there is no longer thought to stretch the century which David Frederick Strauss postulated when he wrote his *Life of Jesus*, nor even the half-century demanded by others. Twenty-five years after the date assigned by all to the violent death of this man "under Pontius Pilate",[1] certain authentic and relatively considerable writings, the letters of Paul, take for their fundamental theme Jesus of Nazareth, his life and his death. "A short *Life of Jesus*," wrote Ernest Renan in the last chapter of his last book, "could be made from the epistles to the Romans, to the Corinthians, and to the Galatians, and also from the epistle to the Hebrews, which is not by St. Paul, but is certainly very ancient";[2] and this is very evident.

---

[1] *Luke* iii, 1–2. On the details of this synchronism and its precedents amongst the Greek historians, see A. Wikenhauser, *Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert*, Münster i.W. 1921, p. 143.

This first authentication permits us to pass over the preliminary question concerning the historical existence of Jesus; but it does not dispense us from studying profoundly the sources of his history, which naturally divide into Christian and non-Christian. These must now be our study.

---

[1] On that see the monograph by G. Baldensperger: *Il a rendu témoignage sous Ponce Pilate.* Strasburg, 1922.

[2] *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, V., Paris, 1894, Ch. XVIII, p. 416, note 1. Renan dates *Hebrews* "about the year 66", "before 70"; see *L'Antéchrist*, Paris, 1873, p. xiii, passim.

# *CHAPTER I*

# THE NON-CHRISTIAN SOURCES

These sources will not detain us long, for they are, on the question of Christian origins, few and meagre in positive information ; but we cannot ignore them. The origins of a religious movement are as a rule little noticed and that only by those involved in the movement. It is later on, when the new group collides, in the course of its expansion, with established situations, when it upsets habits, and disturbs ambitions and diverse interests, that attention is drawn to it. Then historians give it a place in their writings, if they do not consider it advisable to maintain silence. But until then, and indeed even in these early references to it also, we cannot expect more than passing allusions of moderate accuracy, and sometimes entirely prejudiced and unjust. What Roman authors of the first centuries tell us concerning the Jews, although there was an important colony of them in Rome for a lengthy period, is very instructive on this point.[1]

Now this law of historical psychology applies in the present case. While they suffice to place outside all doubt the reality of the human life of Jesus, together with certain major features of his career, such as the approximate dates, the scenes of his activity, his violent death, and his posthumous influence, the Jewish and pagan documents are of only indirect utility in that they enable us to realise some of the peculiarities of the circumstances in which Christianity had its birth.

---

[1] Cf. the texts collected by Theodore Reinach: *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaisme*, Paris, 1895, pp. 237–283. " In them truth is, as it were, submerged in fables, and lying and hatred are more largely represented therein than benevolence and impartiality. . . . But all is not prejudice, error or calumny in what the ancients said of the Jews ", p. xix.

## I. JEWISH SOURCES

To be more precise, the Jewish historians one generation later than Jesus seem to have observed an attitude of reserve, if they did not maintain a total silence, in regard to him.[1] Justus of Tiberias, for instance, the rival of Flavius Josephus, wrote in the period 67–70 along with a *History of the Jewish War*, a *Chronicle of the Jewish Kings*, from Moses to Agrippa I, who died in A.D. 44. These works are now lost, but Photius, who had read the last-named, reproaches the author with having, " according to the vice common to the Jews, he being himself a Jew by race, entirely passed over in silence the advent of Christ, all that happened to Him, and His miraculous works."[2]

The case of Josephus, of whose works, unlike those of Justus, we have preserved a great number, is more complex. In his *Jewish Antiquities*, compiled ten years before the end of the first century, this historian alludes to two characters in the Gospel story : John the Baptist, and James of Jerusalem " the brother of the Lord ", who was put to death in A.D. 62 through the intrigues of the high priest Annas (one of the five sons of that Annas who figures in the Passion of Christ). The authenticity of these texts being certain,[3] there is no doubt that Josephus knew of at least the existence and the main outlines of primitive Christianity. A further passage in the *Antiquities* which slightly precedes that dealing with John the Baptist contains explicit statements on the very person of Jesus. Thus, after telling how Pilate sternly repressed the popular clamour, provoked by a measure concerning a new water supply for Jerusalem, he adds (according to the received text) :

---

[1] On the Jewish literature relative to Jesus Christ, there may be read the recent statement made by Rabbi J. Klausner in his *Jesus of Nazareth*, London, 1925, pp. 18–54.

[2] *Bibliotheca*, cod. 33, ed. G. Dindorf, *Flavii Josephi opera*, I, p. iii, and note 10 of E. Schürer on Justus, *GJV*, I, pp. 58–63.

[3] On which, and on the whole of this paragraph, see below, p. 190 (Note A. on Josephus and primitive Christianity).

> It was also at this time that Jesus appeared, a wise man, if he is to be called a man. For he was the performer of astonishing works, the master of those who receive truth with joy, and he led away many of the Jews, as well as many others from Hellenism. He was the Christ. And when Pilate had crucified him on the denunciation of the leaders of our nation, those who had first loved him did not cease to do so. And he appeared to them living again on the third day, as the holy prophets had foretold, along with many other marvels. And even to the present day the group called (after his name) Christians continues to exist.[1]

The authenticity of this passage is much disputed, chiefly for reasons of internal criticism. The majority of contemporary scholars simply consider it to have been interpolated; but other very considerable and independent learned writers[2] energetically maintain the authenticity of the fragment which M. Theodore Reinach, after Ed. Reuss, Renan and others, thinks has been added by a Christian hand. *Adhuc sub judice lis est.*

But it must be acknowledged that anterior probability favours the first opinion, and we can better explain the complete silence of Josephus[3] than an allusion which is at once so occasional and (making all reservations for the possible irony of certain expressions) so stressed. Yet the relative solidity of the tradition in favour of the manuscript does not allow us to pass a final judgment, which is why we have felt bound to quote this celebrated passage, while resolved not to make it essential to our work.

The remaining documents of Jewish origin, while convincing against the extravagant hypothesis of a "Jesus myth" (for a merely legendary being is not hated, or disfigured, or pursued by prejudice), and indispensable for an understanding of the message of Jesus, have no right to figure amongst the sources of his life.

---

[1] *Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII, iii, 3, Ed. G. Dindorf; vol. IV, p. 157, Ed. Naber; nn. 63–64, Ed. Niese. We have translated the last word *φῦλον* by *group*, for the word *tribe* seemed too Jewish, while *sect* is a little tendentious.

[2] For example, Père Lagrange and Mgr. Batiffol hold, with Schürer and Niese, that it is entirely an interpolation; while F. C. Burkitt of Oxford, W. Emery Barnes of Cambridge, and Adolf von Harnack of Berlin defend its authenticity.

[3] For the reasons of this silence and the details of the various opinions, see Note A, p. 190.

The imposing collection of decisions and memoranda which have been preserved for us under different though closely related forms in the two so-called Talmuds of Jerusalem and Babylon without doubt contain a large number of references which aim at Christ directly, or at least by way of positive allusion. Now, we know that the Talmuds,[1] definitely fixed in the fifth and sixth centuries by the Rabbis of what were then the two principal Schools, the Palestinian and the Babylonian, have brought together, along with the later interpretations of these Schools, a whole previous collection of traditions, which was compiled about 220 by the patriarch Rabbi Judas, "the Prince" or "the Saint," who was descended in the direct line, through the two Gamaliels, from the celebrated Hillel, and is often called, *par excellence*, simply "the Rabbi."[2] In this collection itself, the Mishna (which is composed of sixty-three, or according to the old enumeration sixty, treatises[3] divided into six orders or books), casuistry predominates; but historical notes are not entirely absent. Thus the Talmuds are found to contain sentences, decisions, speeches, going back through the glosses of four generations of Rabbis for the Mishna, and of five others for the remainder, to the Masters of Machabæan times,[4] who are quoted comparatively in pairs. At once the most recent and the most illustrious of these, Hillel and Shammai, were hardly the elders of Christ.[1]

---

[1] See on this point the article by W. Bacher in the *Jewish Encyclopedia: Talmud*, XII, 1–27; W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *A Short Survey of the literature of rabbinical and mediaeval Judaism*, London, 1920, pp. 11–25; and especially H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1921, pp. 5–23, 150–154 (literature).

[2] On the preponderant part played by "the Rabbi" in the drawing-up of the Mishna, see Strack, *op. cit.*, p. 16 *seq.* A uniform and ancient tradition guarantees the fact in substance, but it does not prove that the whole actual work of the drawing-up of the Mishna can be traced back to the great-grandson of Gamaliel I. On the contrary, it is certain that the text has undergone remodelling and later additions.

[3] The division into sixty-three treatises was definitely introduced by the famous Moses Maimonides (d. 1204). Formerly the three "Gates, *Baboth*" which concern the Fourth Order, made only one, and there were only sixty treatises. The details are to be found in Strack, *op. cit.*, p. 24 *seq.*

[4] From about 150 B.C. to the eve of the Christian era.

Thus it is plain that the allusions concerning Jesus in the Talmuds are not to be rejected instantly like stories of an untrustworthy period. An uninterrupted chain of doctors, profiting by the use of excellent mnemotechnical methods,[2] link the anonymous compilers of the Palestinian collection and the better-known casuists of the Babylonian selection, Rab Abina, Rab Tesphaa, Rab Ashi, with Christian origins and even with earlier times.

Unfortunately the examination of the documents is on this point entirely unfavourable to them. They are a collection of odious fables in which history (the history of Jesus) plays no part, for we have therein a striking example of how legend evolves, so to speak, in a sealed flask, supervised and controlled, hatred expressing itself by insinuations and suggestions. Beginning in the very lifetime of the Master, at the hands of jealous scribes who attribute his works to the Evil One (*Mark*, iii, 22), this legend grows steadily with time. Towards the middle of the second century St. Justin roundly accuses the leaders of the Jewish people,[3] "the princes of the priests and doctors", with "making the Son of God profaned and blasphemed throughout the world." Taken up again by Tertullian, by Origen, and by all the Christian authors who have dealt with this subject, the complaint is confirmed by an attentive reading of the Talmudic passages in which there is any question of Jesus.[1] And these base calumnies have not even the excuse of probability: "The life of Jesus is sometimes referred back to the time of Alexander Jannaeus, sometimes to that of the Rabbi Aqiba (or further back still) with a latitude of more than 200 years."[2] Can the excuse of ignorance be pleaded, as certain Jewish critics try to make out?[3] Undoubtedly that would be greater simplicity than may be presumed in the leaders of the nation. At any rate, the touches of hideous caricature drawn little by little in the rabbinical collections unite with the passage of the years into a complete portrait. An anonymous pamphlet drawn up in the first place in Aramaic, perhaps in the sixth century, circulated in many editions from the early Middle Ages under the name of *Toledoth Jeshu* (The Generations or Life of Jesus). Agobard, the Bishop of Lyons, and a contemporary of Charlemagne, knew its principal features; and we are told by the Protestant savant Arnold Meyer, who is the most recent scholar to reunite its origins, that it is "an explosion of low fanaticism, of hateful sarcasm and of coarse imagination". It goes without saying that no Jewish critic any longer dreams of utilising these inventions for any historical purpose. The great compilation in which modern Judaism is most scientifically expressed devotes to Jesus an article which is divided into three parts: the first two, *Jesus in History*, and *Jesus in Theology*, are based on Christian sources, and interpreted very freely; only the third, *Jesus in Jewish*

---

[1] In reckoning the generations which link the Pairs (*Zugoth*, of old Masters, Machabæans and Pre-Christians, with the compilers of the Mishna (these four generations are called those of the "Instructors": *Tannaim*), and the compilers of the Talmud (these five generations are termed those of the "Interpreters": *Amoraim*), I follow, it must be understood, the Jewish authorities, these divisions making possible a sufficiently comprehensive agreement.

[2] See Note C, p. 203. The object of their teaching was the transmission and literal preservation of doctrine. "Rabban Jochanan ben Zaccai had five disciples. . . . He summed up their praises thus: Eliezer ben Hyrcan is a water-tight cistern from which not a drop of water can escape": *Pirké Aboth*, II, 10; in Strack, *Die Sprüche der Väter*, Leipzig, 1901, II, 8; and in *APOT*, p. 696. Elsewhere, among the four types of the good disciple the first named is the sponge, because it absorbs everything (*ibid.*, V, 18; p. 709).

[3] *The Dialogue with Trypho*, ch. cxvii, n. 3, ed. G. Archambault, Paris, 1909, II, p. 202.

---

[1] A *résumé*, together with bibliography, will be found in Vol. II, Bk. IV., Ch. III, I (Subsect. 2), *The Jews.*

[2] Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs.* Paris, 1909, p. 289. Alexander Jannaeus lived in the period 104–78 B.C.; and the Rabbi Aqiba died about A.D. 130.

[3] "Already, in ancient times, there circulated amongst the Jews extremely gross fables about Jesus, in which it seems that several personages of different epochs were confounded. The Jews did not know the Gospels, the reading of which appeared criminal to them; they knew hardly anything accurate about his life, and they even placed him about a century too soon. . . . The history of Jesus in the Talmud is so confused that the Rabbis of the Middle Ages could, with the best faith in the world, maintain that the Jesus in the Talmud was not the Christian Jesus." Isidore Loeb, *La Controverse religieuse entre les Chrétiens et les Juifs au Moyen Age* in the *RHR*, XVII, 1888, p. 317.

*Legend*, takes account of rabbinical sources. And the same is true of the recent works on the life of Jesus written by Jews.[1]

### II. PAGAN SOURCES

Much more important, in its very dryness and disdain, which guarantee its disinterestedness, is the witness of the Roman historians, of whom four are to be found in the first quarter of the second century. Thus, Suetonius alludes to Christianity, and almost certainly to its Founder. The context, which is generally suppressed, is worth recalling. Retracing, in his usual impassive manner, the foreign policy of Claudius, the historian notes, between an exemption accorded to the Troans, and a favour granted to the Germans, that Claudius " expelled from Rome the Jews who had become under the influence of Chrestus a permanent cause of disorders". This information refers to the year 51-52, and is explained best by a confusion on the part of Suetonius, who attributes to Christ himself disorders which had broken out among the Roman Jews, as a sequel to differences with the Christians.[2] In another passage, in which he speaks in terms of praise of the reforms carried out under Nero, Suetonius,

---

[1] The article on *Jesus of Nazareth*, *JE*, vol. VII, col. 160–178, is by J. Jacobs (*Jesus in History*), K. Kohler (*Jesus in Theology*), and Samuel Krauss (*Jesus in Jewish Legend*). See Vol. II, Bk. IV, Ch. III.

[2] *Judaeos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.* (*Vita Claudii*, n. 25.) *Chrestus* here means *Christus*. Instances abound which show the first form used in the second century, in the compound *Chrestiani*. " The Romans about the year 200 (as we know from Tertullian) still said *chrestiani* ". (Batiffol: *Rabbins et Romains*, in *Orpheus et l'Evangile*, Paris, 1910, pp. 43–44.) For its use by Tacitus, see p. 14, n. 2. Moreover, the fact reported in *Acts*, xviii, 3, concerning a Christian household of Jewish origin (that of Aquila and Priscilla), which St. Paul visited at Corinth in 52, " because Claudius had ordered all the Jews to leave Rome ", confirms our interpretation. Besides, the text does not say " *impulsore Chresto quodam:* under the influence of a certain Christ " as some too partial translators have made him say. In that case, we might imagine an unknown Jewish agitator bearing the then common name of *Chrestus*. The hypothesis which identifies the *Chrestus* of Suetonius with the Christ, which was considered by Renan as " almost a certainty " (*Saint Paul*, p. 99, n. 3), has become in our time " almost common ", says Preuschen in his note *Chresto impulsore: ZNTW*, XV, 1914, p. 96.

Many scholars have thought that they have found in a papyrus of Alexandrian origin published by Mr. Idris Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, London, 1924, the between a mention of the repeal of the sumptuary laws and a reference to the effective control of the police, states incidentally: "punishments were inflicted on the Christians, a people addicted to a new and evil superstition".[1]

These same facts Tacitus treats with less inhumanity and more detail. For instance he knows whom these *Chrestiani*[2] are, whom Nero punished with such exquisite torments. "Their name comes from Christ, who, under the rule of Tiberius, was delivered up to punishment by the procurator Pontius Pilate. Though suppressed at the time, this detestable superstition broke out afresh, not only in Judea where this evil had taken birth, but also in Rome where everything horrible and shameful in the world gathered together and found numerous disciples".[3] In its lordly brevity, and its truly Roman prejudice against all foreign superstitions, this note contains five affirmations of fact, all of importance and, from whatever source Tacitus obtained them, very accurate. It connects the Christians punished in Rome by Nero in 64 with Christ, himself slain in Judea, under Tiberius, by the orders of the procurator Pontius Pilate.

The letter from Pliny the Younger to Trajan on the Christians was written a few years before the *Annales* of Tacitus,

---

mention of a similar incident which would be placed at Alexandria sometime after the first year of the reign of Claudius, in 41. But this interpretation is disputed. A translation and a study of this document will be found in an article by Père d'Alès, *Les Juifs d'Alexandrie et l'empereur Claude*, in *Etudes*, t. 182 (1925), pp. 693–701. Cf. Lagrange, *RB*, 1925, pp. 621–623.

[1] *Afflicti suppliciis christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae.* (*Vita Neronis*, n. 16.)

[2] It is certainly *chrestiani* that must be read here, as C. Kirch notes after the paleographical study of G. Andresen: *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*, 1902, col. 780 *seq*. However, H. Goelzer in his edition of the *Annales*, Paris, 1925, III, p. 491, reads *Christiani*.

[3] Tacitus, *Annales*, III, Bk. xv, 44, Ed. G. Bude, 1925. On Tacitus's authority in this passage opinions differ. Andresen thinks that Tacitus drew the materials for his short note from the Acts of the Senate. Harnack and, after him, Père Corssen decide for Josephus. See the article by Corssen, *Die Zeugnisse des Tacitus und Pseudo-Josephus über Christus*, in the *ZNTW*, XV, 1914, pp. 114–141. Mgr. Batiffol suggests with more probability the *Historiae* of Pliny the Elder as the source drawn on. The work of Pliny, who had accompanied Titus to the siege of Jerusalem in 70, has been lost, but we know that Tacitus made use of it in the part of his *Historiae* (V, 2, *seq.*) in which he speaks of the Jews and of Judæa. (*Orpheus et l'Evangile*, pp. 46–49.)

between 111 and 113. To the value attaching to an incontestable document this letter adds all the interest of a direct impression made upon a magistrate (Pliny had been praetor at Rome) who was at the same time a great man of letters. Never having previously had occasion to take action against the Christians, of whom he seems to know scarcely more than the name, the legate in Bithynia sees himself placed, by reason of repeated denunciations, under the legal necessity of proceeding to an inquiry. He confesses his hesitations to his imperial friend. Must he punish the simple profession of Christianity and even the fact of having been a Christian? (One of the prisoners had stated that he had ceased to be a Christian for the last twenty years!) At first the policy followed was this: after two or three formal interrogations, accompanied by threats of capital punishment, the legate sentenced to death those of the accused who persisted in declaring themselves Christians. But cases speedily multiplied and became more complex; thus, an anonymous denunciatory list containing a quantity of names had been submitted to Pliny; and, on the other hand, some of the accused had offered incense and made libations before the statues of the gods. They even went so far as to curse Christ, which, Pliny continues, he has been told, no real Christian would do.

He went on in his letter to say that the crimes generally brought against the Christians had not been confirmed by the inquiry, even when torture had been applied, and particularly in the case of two women who were termed "deaconesses." No: all that had been proved were morning gatherings on fixed days; hymns to Christ in which he was invoked as God; an oath, not to commit, but to prevent, certain crimes; and evening gatherings at which a common meal was taken; in a word, everything quite innocent, and nothing whatsoever evil,[1] except superstition that was excessive and therefore blame-worthy. In these circumstances he thought it best to consult the Emperor, the more so as the Christians were numerous in his province, so that the temple ceremonies were deserted, and the meats that had been offered to the idols found hardly any purchasers. Must he prosecute all these people?

---

[1] *Adfirmabant . . . quod essent soliti stato die ante diem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne*

In his reply, preserved for us in the collection of the *Letters* of Pliny, Trajan approved the line adopted by his friend, but made certain distinctions: there must be no general inquisition; in case of actual denunciation, he should punish those who remained obstinate, but not those who agreed to deny Christ; and anonymous denunciations, "a barbarous and out-of-date system," must no longer be allowed.

A few years later, about 125, the Emperor Hadrian gave similar instructions to the proconsul of Asia, Minucius Fundanus. The predecessor of the latter, Serennius Granianus, had brought to the notice of the highest authorities several abuses resulting from the proceedings against the Christians: seditious accusations, or those which were anonymous or basely interested. Accordingly Hadrian decreed that accusers must present themselves in person before the proconsul's tribunal, and there justify their accusation in restrained terms. Minucius was to punish the Christians if they were found guilty, and similarly the accusers, if they were found to be mere calumniators.[1]

This collection of notices of pagan origin may seem meagre and not very explicit, but its origin and the clearness of the facts it enumerates and the situations it supposes, give it considerable importance. But no comparison is possible between this handful of sheaves and the superabundant harvest yielded by the Christian documents.

---

*furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent . . . quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium. Plinii Secundi Epistularum*, Bk. X, 96, ed. Müller, Leipzig, 1903. Wilcken has proved in *l'Hermes*, XLIX, 1914, p. 120 *seq.*, that Pliny's letter was written from Amisus (Samsoun) or its neighbourhood. See Harnack, *Neue Studien zu Marcion*, Leipzig, 1923, p. 29.

[1] The text of Hadrian's rescript has been preserved by Eusebius, *HE*, IV, 9. St. Justin takes account of it in his first *Apologia*, ch. lxix, about twenty years after the Emperor's reply.

## *CHAPTER II*

# THE CHRISTIAN SOURCES

### I. NON-CANONICAL SOURCES

The ancient documents of Christian origin which have not found a place in our canonical collection, the New Testament, need not occupy us long. Not that they are few, or that they are of small scope, but their testimony is of little importance for the history of Jesus. Their interest is elsewhere, in the light which they cast on the way in which popular imagination delighted, in accordance with the times, in adding to and embellishing the canonical Gospels ; and they are also of interest for the interpretation they suggest for many of the representations which figure in Byzantine and mediæval art.[1] But the works properly called aprocryphal, at least those which we possess in entirety (Gospels, Acts, etc.), add nothing to what we already know from other sources concerning the life of Christ. Their unfruitfulness in this matter is exposed by the evidence of the patient mosaic in which Herr Walter Bauer has grouped the information gathered by him from this unprofitable literature.[2] Whether they deal with the years of infancy, the hours of crisis, or the mysteries of the next world (it is well known that the apocryphal writings give themselves free rein on this subject), the harvest in matters concerning the Gospel story is not appreciable. Such touches as there are, insignificant or picturesque, sometimes indecent (that naive indecency in which certain gross minds find a kind of edification), more often puerile, are uniformly fabulous. Even those in which anachronisms are not obvious move in a heavy atmosphere of popular marvels, and in general are founded on no ancient tradition distinct from those embodied in our canonical writings.

---

[1] See the works of Emile Mâle and of G. de Jerphanion.

[2] *Das Leben Jesus im Zeitalter der Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen, 1909. Even more to the point is the collection of ancient apocryphal gospels translated into English from the best critical texts by M. R. James in *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford, 1924, pp. 38–228. It is a little masterpiece of modest learning.

M. Alphonse Séché, in his *Histoire merveilleuse de Jésus*, Paris, 1926, adds to the Gospel text a considerable number of fragments borrowed from the apocryphal writings, distinguishing them by a typographical arrangement from the remainder.

But to a few very old fragments this judgment does not apply unreservedly—collections of the words of the Saviour, or passages related to them, the origin of which can probably be traced to the second century. Men such as Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome have not despised these gleanings, which painstaking scholars have rediscovered and grouped in the works of these Fathers and other ancient writings. Egyptian papyri have also restored to us, during the last quarter of a century and more, some extremely curious remains. By whatever name we call them, *Agrapha*, *Logia*, or *Antilegomena*,[1] these pitiful fragments are not always to be despised. The sentence attributed to Christ by Didymus the Blind is not altogether unworthy to figure side by side with the divine word preserved for us only by St. Paul: "It is more blessed to give than to receive";[2] and worthy of preservation too is the gloss to be found in an ancient manuscript which happily illustrates the Master's attitude towards the Mosaic Law.[1]

---

[1] *Agrapha* means *unwritten*, and refers to the maxims and words of Christ which are not to be found in our canonical books, but only in writings distinct from *Scripture* properly so-called.

*Logia* means *spoken words*, *maxims*, *oracles*, heard from the lips of Jesus.

*Antilegomena* means *disputed*. This word was borrowed by Eusebius, the historian of the Church, from the established classification, partly due to Origen. (*HE*, III, 25). It distinguishes from the books which are *homologoumena* (those received by all), and from the *notha*, (bastards, rejected, certainly unauthentic), an intermediate class, those of the *antilegomena*, the authenticity of which remains disputed, and is not yet either established or wholly to be rejected.

[2] *Acts*, xx, 35. Here is the *agraphon* quoted by Didymus (it is also noted by Origen in his homilies on Jeremias, which survive only in Latin—*Hom.* XX, 3): "He who is near to me is near to the fire; he who is far from me is far from the Kingdom"; Didymus, *In Psalm.* lxxxviii, 8. [Origen's words are: *Qui juxta me est, juxta ignem est; qui longe est a me, longe est a regno.*—Tr.] On the *Agrapha* consult the article by Vaganay in the *DBVS*, I, col. 159–198.

We must notice, too, as being specially interesting, the collections of the "Sayings" (*Logia*) of Jesus[2] and the gospels drawn up in the second century. One or other may go back to the time when the traditional gospel collection, the *Tetramorphus*, had not yet acquired in all the churches the exclusive authority which was accorded to it everywhere, more or less, during the second quarter of the second century. But the *Logia* are only glitter, in which all is not gold; and amongst the works whose composition may be assigned to the second century, the gospels, for instance, drawn up for the Christian communities of Jewish origin,[3] the so-called *Gospel of the Egyptians*, and the *Gospel of Peter*, the only fragments of any size that remain to us belong to the last-named. The chief of these, discovered at Akmîm (Upper Egypt) in 1886, will be given in its entirety further on, less as a source of knowledge than as a standard of comparison with our canonical books. But the *Gospel of Peter*, before this chance find had made some of its pages accessible to us, had its history, which is still instructive. We knew through Eusebius that Serapion, who was bishop of Antioch towards the end of the second century (190–211), and who had trustingly permitted the reading of this manuscript to the people of Rhossos, changed his opinion of it after hearing it read, for he found it to be full of errors. " Of a truth, my brethren," said the bishop, " we receive Peter and the other apostles as the Christ himself, but the writings which have falsely circulated in their name we reject entirely ".[1] Precious as they are for fixing the text of our Gospels and the history of ancient doctrines and errors, it is plain that these remnants, with the exception of a few happy phrases, only offer us fresh reasons for priding ourselves on our canonical books.

---

[1] The famous *Codex Bezae* (so named after the Protestant theologian Theodore Beza, and now at Cambridge; it is ordinarily denoted by the letter D, 05 or δ5 in the notations of C. R. Gregory and H. von Soden, and dates back to the sixth century) has inserted in the text of *Luke*, vi, 4: "This same day, seeing a certain man working on the Sabbath day, Jesus saith to him: 'Man, if thou knowest what thou dost, blessed art thou; if thou knowest it not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the Law'." This is copied into the *DBV*, I, after col. 1768. Harnack thinks it possible that this *logion*, "drawn up in the style of the Synoptists and particularly like that of Luke", may have belonged to the authentic text of our third Gospel, whence Marcion, for reasons easy to understand, expelled it. Moreover the tenor of this passage would have rendered it sufficiently suspect for the exclusion by Marcion to have prevailed. See Harnack's *Neue Studien zu Marcion*, *TU*, XLIV, 4 (3rd series, XIV, 4), p. 36.

[2] So named because each paragraph begins with the words: "λέγει Ἰησοῦς, Jesus said . . .". Two series of *Logia* have been found at Oxyrhynchus (Egypt), and, published first by Grenfell and Hunt, they have been reedited many times. We may mention as one of the more recent editions the work of H. G. White, *The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus*, Cambridge, 1920.

[3] The so-called *Gospels of the Hebrews, the Ebionites, and the Twelve Apostles*. These writings, of which only short fragments remain, give rise to one of the most complex questions in ancient Christian literature. See below, p. 214. Note D.

## II. CANONICAL SOURCES

The veracious and pure sources for the history of Christ are, then, to be found almost exclusively in the collection of ancient Christian writings ordinarily united under the name of the New Testament: the canonical Gospels according to *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*, the *Acts of the Apostles*, the Pauline and Catholic *Epistles*, and the *Apocalypse* of John. This is the New Testament, that is to say the New Alliance, authentic and attested ; the new phase of the unique Alliance established by God himself with mankind.[2]

---

[1] *HE*, VI, 12.

[2] *Testamentum* is the old translation, due perhaps to Tertullian, of the Greek word διαθήκη employed in the Septuagint for the sacred term *berith*, *alliance*, *covenant*. That Bible which records the history of this alliance is called the Old Testament, and St. Paul already speaks in that sense of " the reading of the Old Testament, ἡ ἀνάγνωσις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης", *II Cor.*, iii, 14. The second Bible, the collection recording the history of the new Alliance, is naturally called the New, Testament, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη. It is so designated in Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. Melito of Sardis seems to have been the first to use the words τὰ βιβλία τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης. See Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I, p. 378. The Latin translation of Irenaeus employs the word *testamentum* more than thirty times, and speaks of the *Novum Testamentum* (*AH*, III, 10, 6; III, 12, 14; IV, 9, 3), as well as *utrumque Testamentum* (*AH*, IV, 12, 3), but never for the collection of our books. See J. Hoh, *Die Lehre des Irenaeus über das Neue Testament*, Münster i.W., 1919, pp. 1–4; and on the date of the translation of Irenaeus, a veritable battle-field for the best Christian latinists, the dissertations in the magnificent edition of the *Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei*, by W. Sanday and C. H. Turner, Oxford, 1923. Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *JTS*, XXV (1924), pp. 56–64.

We have not here to relate the formation of this collection of works, but we must pass in review the principal books that form it, estimating at the same time their value as sources for the history of Jesus; we shall follow in this rapid inquiry the chronological order (so far as it is possible to know it) of the appearance of these works.

### A. *St. Paul*

The collection of St. Paul's epistles is composed of thirteen letters (fourteen, if we include *Hebrews*) addressed by the apostle to various personages, churches, or groups of churches. Their general authenticity is so firmly established that it would be superfluous to go over that ground again; none but *II Thessalonians* and *Ephesians* have been the object of recent attacks which deserve a hearing, if not consideration.[1] The Pauline origin of the spiritual epistles of the time of the captivity (*Philippians*, *Colossians*, and *Philemon*) is actually admitted almost unanimously even by the liberal critics; while those who dispute the Pauline authenticity of the *Epistle to the Ephesians* and of the pastoral epistles (*I* and *II Timothy*, and *Titus*), recognise that these epistles are almost as old as, and consequently that their value as testimony is almost equal to, that of St. Paul. As for the great epistles of the time of St. Paul's maturity (*Galatians*, *I* and *II Corinthians*, and *Romans*), which will be especially made use of in this present work, there are no historical documents more solidly established, whether we consider the ancient attestations of which they are the subject, or whether we stop short at their contents. The doubts raised about them by a few *enfants perdus* of the Dutch School have not succeeded in impressing any scholar worthy of the name, and an exegete so radical as Jülicher sees in these fantasies nothing but an inoffensive attack of critical delirium.[1]

---

[1] *II Thessalonians* is less important to our study, and we have not to establish its authenticity, which has been victoriously upheld by G. Milligan, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, London, 1908, pp. lxxvii–xcii, and J. E. Frame, *A Critical Commentary to the Epistles . . . to the Thessalonians*, Edinburgh, 1912, pp. 29–54; also J. Wrzól, *Die Echtheit des Zweiten Thessalonischerbriefes*, Freiburg i.B., 1916, *BS*, XIX, 4. Deissmann acknowledges on his part: "The two epistles to the Thessalonians are authentically letters . . . written during a period of relative repose; they well represent the less classical type of Pauline letter", *Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen, 1923, p. 201. On *Ephesians* and *Hebrews*, see Note E below, p. 221.

And in all the epistles, from *I Thessalonians*, which is the oldest, to the Pastorals, in those which, as regards a part of their contents, are almost treatises (*Romans* and *Ephesians*), as in those which are above all, or exclusively, letters (*Corinthians*, *Philippians*, and *Philemon*), there breaks out one of the most forceful personalities that ever existed. Indeed, the danger, in the study of Christian origins, would be to allow oneself to be so dazzled by this genius and brilliancy that the proportions of all the rest would be altered ; if you gaze at the sun you will, unless you are careful, see luminous spots on everything else.

This is not to deny that there remain, in the career of Paul of Tarsus, some obscure periods, such as that which preceded his first apostolate in Antioch in 42,[2] and that which, twenty years later, followed his first period of captivity in Rome. But the rest is, at least for the greater part, wonderfully clear.

---

[1] "*Eine Krankheitserscheinung*" in *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Tübingen, 1906, pp. 20–21. M. G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga has taken the trouble to write the history of this little School, descended through Bruno Bauer from the extreme left wing of Hegelianism: *Die hollandische radikale Kritik des Neuen Testaments*, etc., Jena, 1912. Johannes Weiss devoted a few pages to refuting their arguments in his *Das Urchristentum*, Göttingen, 1917, pp. 110–119.

This critical delirium still breaks out here and there to-day. Thus, E. Sievers, *Die paulinischen Briefe klanglich untersucht*, I Heft, Leipzig, 1926, only recognises as authentic about one quarter of *Romans;* the rest he distributes among six principal authors and forty secondary writers.

[2] F. Prat, *Saint Paul*, Paris, 1922, pp. 30 *seq.*, 182 *seq.* For the chronology of the apostolic age, and particularly for that of St. Paul, we follow the dates established by the same author in his article *La Chronologie de l'âge apostolique* in *RSR*, 1912, pp. 372–392. Two facts in profane history: the replacement of the Procurator Felix by Festus in 59–60 (or, less probably, in 54, 55, or 56), and the proconsulate of Lucius Junius Gallio, elder brother of Seneca, at Corinth in 52, have made possible the establishment, on foundations that are approximate yet, within their limits, certain, of the chronology of the life of the apostle. The last of these dates, and the surest, is due to an inscription discovered at Delphi and published in 1905 by M. E. Bourguet (*De rebus Delphicis imperatoriae aetatis capita II*, Montpellier, 1905). The significance of this document in relation to St. Paul was first pointed out by A. J. Reinach in the *Revue des Etudes Grecques of* 1907,

About ten years younger than Jesus, and not having known him "in the days of his flesh," Saul was, although a Jew "circumcised from the eighth day, of the race of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew and the son of Hebrews,"[1] a child of that Diaspora of which we shall have to speak later. He belonged, then, to a dispersed nation and (however fenced around it might be by its traditions, however well defended behind the hedge which the party of the Pharisees strove to thicken between the Israel of God and "the Gentiles, sinners")[2] one which was subject to inevitable influences.

---

p. 49, and by Louis Jalabert, *DAFC* (see *Epigraphie*, I, col. 1428), and has since been universally recognised. There are reproductions in facsimile, with a commentary in Deissmann's *Paulus* (Tübingen, 1911, frontispiece, and pp. 159–177). This letter was addressed by Claudius to the Delphians, Gallio being proconsul of Achaia, and himself hailed as *imperator* for the 26th time; and it is proved by epigraphical documents that this *salutatio* took place between 25th January 51, and August 1st 52. Moreover since the proconsular magistracy lasted only one year, from May to May, it follows that Gallio was proconsul in Achaia in 52, and it was therefore between May 51, and May 53, that St. Paul was led before his tribunal at Corinth. (*Acts*, xviii, 12.) See A. Brassac, *Une inscription de Delphes et la chronologie de saint Paul*, *RB*, 1913, pp. 36 *seq.*; 207 *seq.* L. Cantarelli, in the *Rendiconti r. Acad. dei Lincei*, Vol. XXXII, 1923, thinks that Gallio remained in Corinth between the end of April 52, and September 52. In 53 he became *consul suffectus*. See Jean Collin: *Revue des Etudes anciennes*, Vol. XXVI, 1924, pp. 295–296.

We can estimate the possible error in regard to the dates assigned to the essential facts in the career of St. Paul by a comparison of the two chronologies which unequally share the favour of scholars. The first figures are those adopted by Père F. Prat, *loc. laud;* the second, between brackets, those which, following Ed. Schwartz and some others (see especially Bousset, *RGG*, IV, 1913, col. 1282), Loisy proposes as being approximately correct in his work, *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, etc., Paris 1922, pp. 16–17.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Passion and Death of Christ . . . . | 29 or 30. | [29] |
| Conversion of Paul . . . . . | 36 or 34. | [31] |
| Paul at Antioch . . . . . . | 42 | [33] |
| The assembly of the Apostles (Apostolic Council) at Jerusalem . . . . . . | 49 or 50. | [43 or 44] |
| Paul at Corinth . . . . . . | 50 or 51. | [50 to 52] |
| First imprisonment . . . . . | 57 or 58. | [56] |
| Death of Paul . . . . . . | 66 or 68 | [61] |

[1] *Phil.*, iii, 5.

[2] *Galat.*, ii, 15

Tarsus in particular, at that time a town of considerable size, Greek in language and culture, Roman through the favour of the Cæsars, the chief stage on the only land route connecting Syria with Asia and Europe,[1] was a centre of the most eclectic civilisation ; and the life and writings of Paul bear its mark. He knew how to claim the prerogatives of his race, but also how to avail himself of the rights of Roman citizenship, which at that time was much less abused than it came to be in succeeding centuries. The autobiographical passage given in *Acts*, which shows us the young Pharisee " at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed in the exact knowledge of the Law,"[2] is confirmed by the reading of the Epistles, the more so as these take more the form of a treatise, involving the appearance of a scholastic dissertation. Semitic rhythms, moreover, are visible in all the apostle's developments—here and there even as much perhaps as in the evangelical " strophes ", which are the most impossible to ignore.[3]

But this Semite shattered the rigidity of forms and exceeded the literary atomism familiar to the men of his race. He knew how to push an idea, to remodel it, to shade it and to stress it otherwise than by the variety of terms of comparison and their parallel opposition. When certain scholars[1] seek to establish in the Epistles the presence of the technical processes of the Stoic School, we may certainly raise a discreet doubt; but it is impossible to deny that something of the progressive and harmonious character of Greek eloquence may have been impressed upon them. One very good judge even considers that the profound sources of Hellenic lyricism, which at that time seemed to have dried up, welled forth anew in the letters of Paul, and so excellently that to find analogies for them he has to go back to the masterpieces of Plato or to the famous hymn of Cleanthes. Even the very language of Paul feels the effects of this, and Edward Norden adds: "In these passages, the apostle's diction rises even to the level of Plato's in the *Phædrus*."[2]

---

[1] Sir William Ramsay, *Roads and Travels in the New Testament*, in *DBH*, Extra Volume, p. 388.

[2] *Acts* xxii, 3. The words refer to Gamaliel I, grandson of Hillel, and great-great-grandfather of Rabbi Judas the Prince, chief compiler of the Mishna. No serious critical argument supports the opinion of Kohler, who denies all rabbinical training to St. Paul, on the ground that " certainly he could not have written and acted as he did, if, as is pretended, he had been the disciple of Gamaliel I, the gentle Hillelite " ! (*J.E.*, XI, p. 79, " Saul of Tarsus ".) Perhaps it is a case of repeating: *Credat Judaeus Apella*.

[3] For example, *Rom.*, xiv, 7–9; and *I Cor.*, ii, 6–9. I borrow these examples from the pages in which J. Weiss has summed up his *Beitraege z. paulinischen Rhetorik* (Göttingen, 1897), in his *Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1917), p. 309 *seq.* The statement of the facts is the more striking in that Weiss insists more on the Hellenic culture of St. Paul. But we think that he exaggerates in attributing an " artistic . . . almost refined " character to methods which restore more than one form which is immemorial and is partly determined in the medium. Loisy has equally recognised the fact, without stating its causes, in his translation of the Epistles: *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, pp. 32 *seq.*, also *Actes du Congrès international d'histoire des Religions of* 1923, Paris, 1925, II, pp. 321–330. See also his article *Le style rythmé du Nouveau Testament*, in the *Journal de Psychologie* for May, 1923, pp. 405–439. Cf. below, Note C. p. 203.

Yet the man very often gets the better of the writer, and reduces to a secondary, a subordinate, rôle the qualities in the epistles which can be attributed to one or the other of the cultures which were assimilated by St. Paul. We can affirm, without fear of contradiction by any who have tried to translate a few of his pages, that no one has ever written like this man. There are certainly more correct authors; it would be easy to name many writers who are more polished, more limpid, and better balanced; but never has there been one more passionate, more original, or, in the literary sense of the word, more inspired. Assuredly, many of the apostle's points of view come to modify themselves with the passage of years, and with the concrete needs dealt with by his letters ; but it must never be forgotten that these are, above all, writings intended for the circumstances of the moment. Thus, the thought of the Last Things, which dominates the older Epistles, later cedes the first place to a description of the Gospel economy and to what St. Paul calls *par excellence* "the mystery", the substitution of the Gentiles for the Jews in the Israel of God ; the union in one single mystical body of all Christians, of whom Christ is the head, the principal of unity and of the higher life and even of the spiritual atmosphere. Moral and pastoral preoccupations run through the whole work from the first to the last Epistle; while the language undergoes changes which correspond with the underlying thought.

---

[1] R. Bultmann, *Der Styl der Paulinischen Predigt und die Kynischstoische Diatribe*, Göttingen, 1910; R. Boehlig, *Die Geistes-Kultur von Tarsus mit Berucksichtigung der paulinischen Schriften*, Göttingen, 1913. Certain sound judges, such as Prat, in his *Théologie de saint Paul*, II, 44–47, and 560, dispute the use of these academic methods, which the powerful originality of St. Paul's style makes it difficult to reveal.

[2] E. Norden, *Die griechische Kunstprosa*, Leipzig, 1909, II, p. 509. See also the delicate appreciation of St. Paul as a writer in the posthumous work of the best connoisseur of New Testament language in our time: "A highly educated man like Paul, who spent his early years in a great centre of Hellenistic culture, might have used literary Greek as to the manner born. It is very obvious that he did not. The exordium of an address to Athenian philosophers survives to show us that he could use the language of the higher culture when occasion required. But his letters addressed to Churches into which 'not many wise were called', are studiously kept within the range of popular vocabulary and colloquial grammar." (J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Ed. by W. F. Howard, Edinburgh, 1919, Vol. II, 1, pp. 8–9.) Mr. H. J. Rose, in the *JTS* for October 1923, pp. 17–43, studies St. Paul's metrical *clausulae* ("The Clausulae of the Pauline Corpus") after the method applied by Zielinski to Cicero, and claims to draw from this study firm conclusions on the authenticity of various Epistles.

But what does not change, what is fundamental and inimitable, is, together with certain instinctive mannerisms, the necessity and the art of infusing into the words a powerful feeling, of charging them, so to speak, with passion. This is true even of long digressions, less diffuse than branching, interspersed with incidents, sometimes leading away (and for quite a long time) on a side path that suddenly opens out, and then leading back, as though it was of no account, to the original plan, which reduces to unity (if we take the word in a wide enough sense) an apparently haphazard arrangement of ideas. So, too, there are copious enumerations, and expressions which are almost synonymous—each of which, nevertheless, adds a shade of meaning ; there are favourite words which, at one time in his life, seem to force themselves upon the apostle, and which he uses in analogous and yet diverse senses indicated by the context and by the turn of his phrase ; and there are, too, familiar moulds whence his seething thought bursts out, at the risk of straining, twisting, and shivering them. Elevation, supplication, apostrophe, irony, imprecation, all the rhetoric of passion is there—but a rhetoric which scorns conventional rhetoric. In these writings are the cries, the appeals, the tears, the enthusiasms or the groanings of a man who loves, who suffers, who compassionates, who waxes indignant, who melts with pity, who is raised to a pitch of excitement, and is sometimes near to madness; one whom solicitude torments, whom the appearance of ingratitude freezes, whom zeal devours. And it all goes to make up a unique style; all these metals are cast into a homogeneous alloy: for the love of Christ, whose spouse and whose mystical body is the Church, unifies all in Paul's heart. This general tone makes the apostle's letters incomparable as historical documents. We can hold as negligible anyone, however scholarly, who raises a doubt about the authenticity of *Galatians* or *II Corinthians*.

But do not the apostle's very superiority and the creative force of his genius make suspect, or less acceptable, his presentation of the facts of the Gospel? Is there a sure continuity between the Master of Nazareth and the glorified Christ whom Paul introduces to his readers? A doubt on this subject was insinuated with much subtlety by Ernest Renan in his *Saint Paul;* since then the suggestion has been taken up with a more obvious bias by various writers.[1] In this connection they gladly insist on the ecstatic and visionary character of the author of the Epistles, thereby hoping to disqualify his testimony in historical matters.

We have, indeed, to acknowledge that St. Paul was in fact a great mystic. But his was that choice mysticism the force of whose intuitions of the divine does not dull its sense of the most humble realities. Such also were after him, among many others, Bernard of Clairvaux, Joan of Arc, Teresa of Avila, and Francis Xavier.

---

[1] Renan, *op. cit.*, pp. 274 *seq.*, and especially 308–310. He opposes " the very human figure of the Galilean master " to " the metaphysical type " conceived by St. Paul. But elsewhere in the same work, in conformity with his usual manner, he corrects by various statements, even to the extent of contradiction, the too crude impression conveyed by this phrase. Quite recently a few enthusiasts have pushed to the last extreme the opposition between the Christ of Paul and the Jesus of history. See, for example, P. L. Couchoud, *L'Enigme de Jésus*, in the *Mercure de France* of March 1st, 1923, pp. 391–397.

An organiser, rather than an initiator, the apostle could take account of concrete contingencies. A considerable part of his correspondence is devoted to the personal affairs of those to whom he writes, to the solution of cases of conscience, and to the organisation of collections for the poverty-stricken churches, notably the mother-church of Jerusalem, even to the planning of journeys. Far from being for him mere creatures of reason, vague metaphysical entities, his disciples, his adversaries, and his hearers are living men[1] whom he loves or fights with the whole ardour of his heart, and (we can say it with all respect) with a temperament sensitive to a point beyond that of real moral health. The spiritual gifts which he possessed in abundance by no means imposed an unreal mysticism on him. With the very pen with which he ordered women to remain covered in assemblies of the faithful, he regulates the use of the graces of prophecy and of tongues. His watchword is : " Extinguish not the Spirit ", but he at once adds : " Prove all things [advice which comes naturally from him], hold fast that which is good ".[2]

As for the nature of the testimony rendered by the apostle to the historic Christ, we must, if we are to appreciate it correctly, realise that, as with the other writings of the apostolic era (with the exception of the Gospels),[3] Paul's letters are not didactic instructions intended to enlighten his correspondents on the life and teaching of Jesus: this knowledge they are presumed to have acquired ; and when Paul is led to recall it, implicitly or explicitly,[4] to any extent, he falls back absolutely on the Gospels. Terms for comparison abound between the apostle's preaching and that which has been fixed for ever by our Synoptists.[1] And Paul himself is perfectly aware of this fact: "For whether I or they [the other apostles; he is speaking of the Resurrection of Christ] so we preach: and so you have believed".[2] But this initial instruction, which he transmits to others as he has himself received it, and of which he mentions incidentally one point or another, the apostle supposes to be familiar in general to his correspondents; in this he conforms to the common usage of his contemporaries among Christian writers. The allusions to the human life of Christ, to his parables and his miracles, are as scarce (or even scarcer) in the Catholic Epistles of Peter, John, and James as in the Pauline letters. The *Acts* themselves, excluding the first chapter, which is a link between the Third Gospel and the "Second Discourse" of St. Luke, include no new teaching on Jesus: one single saying of his is quoted textually, and it is placed in St. Paul's mouth.[3] At this time, and for long afterwards, the instruction of the faithful was confined to oral tradition, in which the very tones of the Master seemed to live again: it needed neither the formality of being written, nor an encumbering but fragile embodiment. Thus "the living and enduring word"[4] flew in its purity from lip to lip, like the flame from hand to hand in a torch-race.

---

[1] Renan observes on this, with justice this time, that " he (Paul) had for the churches feelings which other men have for all that is dearest to them ", *op. cit.*, p. 119. See also the three fine remarks made by J. Gresham Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, New York, 1921, pp. 142 *seq.*

[2] *I Thess.*, v, 19–21.

[3] But we must again remark that the Gospels themselves presuppose previous oral instruction. Johannes Weiss shows very well that they are intelligible only on this hypothesis, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 539; and see, by the same author, in *RGG*, III, 1912, col. 2183," *Literaturgeschichte des Neuen Testaments.*"

[4] Implicitly, as in *I* and *II Thessalonians*, in regard to the Last Things, and in the moral portions of the Epistles; explicitly, as in *I Corinthians*, xi, 28 *seq.*; and xv, 1 *seq.*, on the Last Supper and the Resurrection of Our Lord.

Moreover, we should not hesitate to acknowledge that Paul's witness to Christ is powerfully marked by the apostle's mystical turn of mind and by his sensitiveness. In the manner of the great contemplatives, who, for the purpose of a profounder union with God, deliberately allowed the detailed knowledge of divine things to become impoverished in them, St. Paul sometimes seems to retain the remembrance only of the beginning and the end of the human life of his Master, the "advent in the flesh" and the "entry into glory" by the dolorous road of the cross. It is, indeed, on the cross that Jesus appears as the head of redeemed humanity.[1] Without being indifferent to what comes between these two points, the apostle lets it all fall out of sight, reducing to essentials the basis of fact on which he built. The prodigious abridgement in *Philippians*, which takes us directly from the Incarnation to Calvary, is not exceptional in the work of St. Paul.[2] Even as a mighty wave surges over the seashore, submerging the roughnesses, smoothening out the delicate outlines, effacing the picturesque details, and finally letting nothing emerge save only the points of the rocks which mark out the dominant lines, so the theological vision of the apostle has engulfed, in the life of the Word made flesh, everything which is not the indispensable foundation of redemption.

---

[1] We may remember that St. Paul had two of the evangelists as companions and collaborators during several of his missions, and throughout his long Roman imprisonment in 61–62. In two letters written at this time, both undoubtedly genuine, he mentions in a single breath Mark "the cousin of Barnabas", and Luke "the beloved physician", *Col.*, iv, 10–14; and again in *Philem.*, 24.

[2] *I Cor.*, xv, 11.

[3] *Acts*, xx, 35.

[4] "For certainly I did not think there could be drawn from books any utility comparable to that of the living and enduring word", *παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης*: Papias, in Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 4.

This extreme simplification (which, however, as we shall shortly show, has exceptions) would hardly be conceivable in the case of a disciple who had lived familiarly with our Lord. The mystic force of St. John, which is no less strong than St. Paul's, has none the less passed on many a moving detail, and many a characteristic word, of the dear Christ of history. But Paul of Tarsus had not known Jesus in this manner ; the immediate contact which had transformed and converted him was that of the Christ in glory, "born of the race of David according to the flesh", but "established by the Resurrection in possession of the power which belongs to the Son of God ".[1] From this sprang an intense personal love, which is in no way second to that of the fortunate witnesses whose " eyes have seen, whose ears have heard, and whose hands have touched the Word of life " made flesh,[2] but which is yet different. Different again in its modality, although not inferior, was the title which qualified Paul as an apostle. No doubt the essential thing was that he had seen the risen Lord ;[3] but it could not be said of him, as of the candidates put forward to fill the place of the traitor Judas in the apostolic college, that " he had accompanied [the Twelve] all the time during which the Lord Jesus had lived among them, from the baptism of John even to the day when he had been lifted up from the midst of them ".[4] But these differences, which the apostle sometimes proclaimed through a feeling of humility, naming himself an abortion and a latecomer[5] in the apostolic order, he did not allow to be emphasised. He did not like them recalled, especially when less scrupulous opponents attempted to draw thence an argument against the points of his Gospel.

---

[1] In concluding his note on the Pauline vocabulary (most of it exclusively Pauline) in which the preposition *σύν* is so prominent—*συμπάσχειν*, *συσταυροῦσθαι*, *συναποθνήσκειν*—Prat remarks: "an examination of these curious words suggests three interesting considerations to us: *Our mystical union with Christ does not extend over the mortal life of Jesus; it only takes its birth in the Passion, when Christ inaugurated his work of redemption;* . . . and if we go back to the source of this union of identity we see that it exists by right, and in fact, from the moment when the Saviour, acting in the name and for the benefit of guilty humanity, dies for us and makes us die with him". *Théologie de saint Paul*, II, pp. 21–22.

[2] *Phil.*, ii, 5–11.

In such cases he replied by insisting, with a sort of impatience, on the purely spiritual and timeless aspect of the Gospel of Christ. Then a thought seized upon and absorbed him to such a point that there was no longer room in him for any other thoughts : that of the universal efficacy of the Redemption. The death of Jesus and his resurrection are the meritorious cause of this redemption, its speaking symbol and its pledge which cannot be lost : " Let us live then," he concludes, " as raised from the dead ; living for him who died and has risen again for us ! " And on this level, in this new life, the first step must be the subordination or even the abandonment of " carnal " views, ways of thought which still give too much place to what (without being evil, impure, or worldly) is human, not disinterested, exterior, and concerned with what is provisional and ephemeral. Of this last element, capable of clogging spiritual progress but henceforth outstripped, St. Paul wishes to hear no further talk of any kind.

---

[1] *Rom.*, i, 3–4.

[2] *I Jn.*, i, 1.

[3] " Am not I also free ? Am I not an apostle ? Have I not seen Jesus, our Lord ? " *I Cor.*, ix, 1.

[4] *Acts* i, 22.

[5] *I Cor.*, xv, 8.

"What!" some may say, "not even with reference to the human life of Christ? Surely we must make an exception for that? Is that not sacred ground; is there not [and here we can discern the Judaising enemies of the apostle] is there not a special excellence in having known the Master in the course of his earthly pilgrimage? And did not this privilege confer on the Twelve, on 'the brethren of the Lord', on the oldest disciples, an inalienable primacy?"

"Not at all," replies St. Paul. When it is sought to draw from it, not the lessons of life, but a personal advantage, or to found on it a form of aristocracy amongst those who have received the apostolic vocation, this familiar acquaintanceship with Christ becomes comparable to human wisdom, to Hellenic culture, or to the privilege of the chosen race. "Born of the race of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew and the son of Hebrews",[1] Paul no longer sought to avail himself of these honourable qualifications. It is just the same with the knowledge of the Lord Jesus "according to the flesh"; such a thing becomes "carnal", in the strong and denunciatory sense of the word,[2] in those who boast of it as of a title to glory. A perfect Christian must go higher than this; he is a new creature: "The old man has disappeared, behold all is renewed!" On this level the apostle "no longer knows *anyone* according to the flesh". No one at all. And if there were a time (this is a purely hypothetical concession, and not an avowal) when he had known the Christ himself in this purely human manner, well, that time has now passed: "henceforth, we no longer thus know him".[3]

---

[1] *Phil.*, iii, 5.

[2] On the derivation of the sense given to "flesh" and "carnal" in St. Paul's language, see Prat, *Théologie de saint Paul,* II, pp. 487 *seq.*

[3] *II Cor.* v, 14–18. This interpretation of one of the most difficult passages in the New Testament seems to us to do justice to both the letter and the spirit of the text, allowing the indeterminate nature of St. Paul's phrases to remain.

But to conclude from these words that St. Paul was permanently indifferent to the human life and the particular teachings of Jesus would be manifestly an error.[1] They are a reply suggested by St. Paul to the faithful[2] who have been disturbed by the objections of the Judaisers. They express with uncompromising energy the apostle's liberty of spirit,

---

Many exegetes have tried to make them unduly precise—in very various meanings; but we, for our part, believe that they imply no allusion to a "knowledge" of Christ "according to the flesh" which Paul would know to have been his during one period of his life.

To determine the character of this knowledge, and the time during which the apostle would have received it, various hypotheses have been put forward. Plummer, in his book *A Critical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh, 1895, pp. 176–179, mentions and discusses seven of these conjectures. It seems to us that the εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν is purely permissive. It is vain, then, to apply it to a fixed period in his life, during which he might have had a "carnal" knowledge of his Master. If it refers to his life previous to his conversion, it is too obvious and is worthless against his actual opponents; while if it refers to a later period, what a weapon it places in the hands of these same adversaries!

Here we are completely in accord with Prat's substantial note (*La Théologie de saint Paul*, II, p. 27, note 1); we even think that one must go further, and not give a precise temporal sense (e.g. that of his conversion) to "henceforth, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν". The νῦν here rather marks a state of Christian maturity and a point of perfection: the moment when Christ has developed his normal growth in a human life (as St. Paul elsewhere remarks). From that time all is new; the old leaven is cast out along with the carnal alloy, even with reference to the knowledge of Christ.

As for the bearing of this word on the special point here treated of, it is well expressed by Johannes Weiss (*Das Urchristentum*, p. 347): "When his Judaising adversaries insisted on the Jewish origin of Jesus, on his fidelity to the Law and its teaching in this respect, Paul declared, in the unilateral, paradoxical fashion of the mystics, that he no longer wished to know anything of Christ according to the flesh . . .". This does not mean "that he had never known anything, but *that he could no longer attribute any value to those natural and human relations with the Christ in which the Judaisers gloried, and that he only wished to be united in the spirit with the glorified Christ*".

Although he made no pretence to literal exactness, St. Augustine's commentary, to which Plummer refers, seems to us to be quite in the apostle's perspective: *Apostolus . . . iam principium viarum* [*sc. carnem Christi*] *transierat . . . Ex quo intelligitur quam nulla res in via tenere nos debeat, quando nec ipse Dominus, in quantum via nostra esse dignatus est, tenere nos voluerit, sed transire, ne rebus temporalibus quamvis ab illo pro salute nostra susceptis et gestis, haereamus infirmiter, sed per eas potius curramus alacriter*, etc. *De Doctrina Christiana*, I, 38, *ML*, 34, col. 33.

[1] Against this error the most learned exegete of the liberal school, H. J. Holtzmann, protests forcibly in the last edition of his principal work: *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, second edition, by Jülicher and Bauer, Tübingen, 1911, Vol. II, pp. 229–236. "For him [Paul], the transcendent existence of Christ and his historical existence are not separated by an abyss, but joined by a line which reunites them, embracing heaven and earth," p. 234.

[2] *II Cor.*, v, 12.

and mark (to return to a previous metaphor) the extreme advance of the mystical wave. And even then a trained eye can still discern, showing above the flood which has swept over the shore, in the midst of the swirling currents, the varying shadows, and the lashing foam, in the midst of the eddies where swirls the sea-weed, the details of the coast which the tide has covered without sweeping them away.

In the work of St. Paul, after as well as before the declaration which we have quoted, many allusions take us back with certainty to the words and actions of Christ Jesus.[1] And the (for him) very simple way in which the apostle introduces fragments of instruction in reference to the Last Supper and to the Resurrection, taken in conjunction with the precise and circumstantial character of these fragments, is clear evidence that these historical references are not an exception, an unusual feature, in his teaching.

Amongst the moral prescriptions which he inculcates he plainly distinguishes those which have for guarantee the word of Jesus from those which have no other authority than his own word.[2] In addition, we can note that on the counsels which he formulates there plays the reflection of the words of the Gospels,[3] or that of the virtues of our Lord during his human life : his gentleness and modesty,[4] his love for the poor, his effective practice of poverty,[5] and his charity extending to the love of his enemies.[6]

These considerations show us what type of information a historian of Jesus can hope to find in the Pauline Epistles : certain great confident lines, the unshakable foundation of the essential Christian beliefs ; and some allusions which are so much the more precious as they are the less studied in intention. Finally we gain from him (and it is an important lesson which a familiar witness of Our Lord's life could hardly give us) a general view, embracing all, and disengaged from the confused riches of concrete detail and from the overlapping due to too close a perspective. What is admirable in all this is undoubtedly that the familiar witnesses have recognised their Master, with whom they had eaten and drunk, whom they had seen tired out, weeping, and dying, in the Christ of glory whom St. Paul preached.[1] The agreement of the friends and personal disciples of Jesus on this point with the apostle of the uncircumcised is one of the essential supports of the Christian faith.

---

[1] The Pastoral Epistles, especially, are full of these allusions, in the very parts to which the liberal critics attribute a Pauline origin.

[2] " As for those who are married, this is what we command them, or rather what the Lord himself commands them. . . . For the others, I say this to them, not the Lord, but I. . . . As regards virgins, I have no commandment from the Lord." *I Cor.* vii, 10, 12, 25.

[3] This is the case particularly with *Rom.* xii, 14; *I Cor.* iv. 12–13; ix, 14; xii 3, etc. See Sanday: *Paul*, in *DCG*, II, col. 888.

[4] Cf. *II Cor.* x, 1 and *Mt.* xi, 29; and see Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 233–234.

[5] Cf. *II Cor.* viii, 9; and *Mt.* viii, 20.

[6] Cf. *Rom.* xii, 19–21; and *Mt.* v, 39–48; also *Lk.* xxiii, 34.

### B. *The Gospels.*

The term *gospel*, as applied to a written work, has become familiar to us; yet it is a derived word and one of relatively late appearance.

A gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) was, in classical language, a piece of good news, or, more anciently, the gift made to the bearer of good news. In the second part of *Isaias* the expression which designates the Good News *par excellence*, that of the advent and of the glory of the Messias, is rendered in the Greek of the Septuagint by the word *gospel*.[2] Thence it passed into the New Testament, where it always refers to the message of salvation announced to man by Christ[3]; and the person of Jesus forms an integral part of it, by the same right as his teaching. The Gospel is his whole mission, acts and words ; it is indivisibly the divine gift of himself and the divine gifts which he brings.

---

[1] J. Gresham Machen, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

[2] In the form εὐαγγελίζομαι, *Isaias* xl, 9; lxi, 1, all sound passages plainly Messianic; see Condamin, *Le Livre d'Isaïe*, Paris, 1905, p. 242, 315, 354. The word εὐαaγγέλιον is found in a sense analogous to the Christian meaning in an inscription at Priene dating from 9 B.C. and referring to the birth of Augustus "who has been for the world the beginning of tidings of joy (τῶν δι' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίων) from the god [Augustus]". Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 313, facsimile p. 316.

[3] Not once in the New Testament does the word *gospel* (which is to be found frequently in Mark—seven times in addition to *Mk.* xvi, 15—less frequently in Matthew, and very frequently in Paul) not refer to a book or a writing. On the meaning of the preliminary verse (*Mk.* i, 1), see *L'Évangile selon saint Marc*, by Lagrange, second edition, p. 2; and E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*, Tübingen, 1926, pp. 4–5.

For the same reason, the Gospel is one. It is only later that, following a well-known law, the container, the book to which were consigned the principal features of the message of Jesus, became insensibly substituted for the contained, and took to itself the name of Gospel. It was only then that one could speak of the " gospels " in the plural. The word is thus found in the plural and with the meaning of a written account for the first time (so far as we can now tell) towards the middle of the second century in St. Justin's first *Apology*, which alludes to " the memoirs of the Apostles which are called Gospels : *ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια* ".[1]

As for the common title for each of our accounts—*κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον*,[2] etc., which we translate "(gospel) *according to* Matthew, or *according to* Mark," etc.,—it in no way implies a doubt on the person of the author, or a lower dignity attached to the work on account of him. It is simply equivalent to the genitive: Gospel *of* Matthew, *of* John, etc.—which in the second century would not have made sense. There was then only known, as we have just said, one sole Gospel, that of Jesus, although several versions of it were known, those according to Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark.

The little books which receive these names are Greek works of small extent,[3] which were originally on rolls of papyrus. The fragile nature of this material led them later to be transcribed on to parchment or vellum which generally took the form of books not unlike ours: the first of these Gospel books was made during the lifetime of Origen, during the first part of the third century. There have been preserved to our time only some fragments of the copies on papyrus,[1] but in compensation we possess a very great number of manuscripts on parchment, several of which date back to the fifth century, and two undoubtedly to the fourth century. But this is not the place in which to dilate on these. Let us merely note that our actual printed Greek text of the New Testament enjoys in regard to the text of every ancient author, sacred or profane, a privileged position. Whether we consider the number of the manuscripts or the period of time which separates the oldest of these manuscripts from the actual autograph, or whether we consider the number and age of the versions, or the extent and the solidity of the critical work expended on their texts, no comparison is possible. "In the field of classical literature the main difficulty of the textual critic, except in the case of a few extremely popular authors like Homer or Virgil, is the paucity and late date of MSS. No portion of Tacitus, for example, survived the Dark Ages in more than one; and the number of famous works of which, apart from Renaissance reproductions, there are less than half a dozen MSS. is very large. Again, apart from fragments, there are no MSS. of the Greek classics earlier than the ninth century, and very few older than the twelfth.

---

[1] *I Apolog.*, ch. lxvi.

[2] Such in effect (with the exclusion of the word *gospel*) is the common title of the oldest Greek manuscripts, e.g. the Vatican MS, B; and of earlier manuscripts, since those of the Old Latin version which the Vulgate of St. Jerome supplanted read *Cata* Matthaeum, etc. The early Latin Fathers, with the exception of Tertullian, similarly adopted the Greek *Cata*. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, English Ed., Edinburgh, 1909, II, pp. 386–400.

[3] For realising this, the received division of the New Testament into verses, which we owe to Robert Estienne (in his fourth edition published at Geneva in 1551), is somewhat deceptive, for the length of the verses varies. Less arbitrary is the division into stichs, or lines of about 34 to 38 letters (15 to 16 syllables), which has come down to us in numerous ancient manuscripts. The number of stichs contained in the gospels, as shown by Rendel Harris in *Stichometry* (London, 1893, p. 39 *seq.*) is: *Matthew*, 2560; *Mark*, 1616; *Luke*, 2759 (*Acts*, 2556); *John*,

---

2024. On the stich (στίχος) compared with the colon and the comma (κῶλον, κόμμα) and the importance of these divisions for the preservation and the understanding of the text, see the article by R. Schutz, *Die Bedeutung der Kolometrie für das Neue Testament*, in *ZNTW*, XXI, 1922, pp. 161–184.

[1] These fragments are, however, sufficiently numerous for textual criticism to take great account of them. Moreover the antiquity of many of them place them beyond all rivals in value. Thus, the fragment of the Fourth Gospel (*Jn.* xvi, 14–30) published in *Oxryhynchus Papyri* (Part XV) by Grenfell and Hunt, London, 1922, under the number 1781, which belongs to the same manuscript as fragment 208 previously published in Part II of the same collection (*Jn.* i, 23–40; xx, 11–25), goes back to the end of the third century, and is consequently earlier than many of our oldest manuscripts on parchment. See Lagrange, *RB*, XXXV, 1926, pp. 89–91.

The student of the text of the Gospels is confronted with a difficulty of an opposite character. There are more than 2,300 Greek MSS., about forty of which are more than a thousand years old ; there are over 1,500 Lectionaries which contain the greater part of the text of the Gospels arranged as lessons for the year ; there are fifteen Versions in various languages[1] which are evidence of the Greek text used by their translators. In addition, there are innumerable quotations by early Fathers which are, in effect, fragments of other early MSS. now lost. The mass of material to be considered is crushing. The consequences of this are twofold. On the one hand the degree of security that, in its broad outlines, the text has been handed down to us in a reliable form is *prima facie* very high. On the other, the problem of sorting the material in order to determine those minuter points which interest the critical student is proportionately complex."[2]

Furthermore, Hort, the most exact and the surest of the textual critics of the nineteenth century, summed up as follows the memorable investigation made through twenty-five years by his colleague, Westcott, and himself:

"The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is very great, not less, on a rough computation, than seven-eighths of the whole. The remaining eighth, therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other comparative trivialities, constitutes the whole area of criticism. . . . The amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation is but a small fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text."[3] The immense amount of work expended since then on comparison and collation has qualified this statement without shaking it.

---

[1] To speak of only one of these Versions, the Sahidic or Thebaic, which is in the Coptic language: we have a considerable portion of this Version (for the *Acts*, see Horner: *The Coptic Version of the N.T. in the Southern Dialect otherwise called Sahidic*, VI, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford, 1922) on a papyrus which is slightly later than 300, consequently nearly a hundred years earlier than our oldest manuscripts in Greek. This papyrus, in view of the extreme literalness of the version, gives us the state of the original text at the moment of translation into Coptic, i.e. towards the middle of the third century.

[2] Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, London, 1924, p. 33.

[3] *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, II, London, 1882, p. 2. For his part Cladder concludes: ' We can have a firm confidence, on a scientific basis, that

### c. *The Literary Character of the Gospels.*

It is only lately that any attempt has been made to determine the place of the Gospels in general literature. Reasons of unequal value explain this long-standing lacuna in a matter to which so many scholars have devoted their lives and their hearts. Many of these would have recoiled from comparing the Gospels with profane literature, and, in this connection, the excessive and rigid theory of inspiration which prevailed in certain Protestant circles exercised a lasting influence, even on Reformed scholars who were only too detached from this way of thinking. Equally respectable and possessing greater justification is the sense of the originality and, so to speak, transcendence of the Gospels ; they are not to be placed side by side with, or even above, other works written by the human hand : they are outside them, other than them, incommensurable with them.

But none the less the question has been raised, since an ever-growing number of critics, in the country in which New Testament studies have reached their greatest development, no longer believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures in the full and proper sense of the word. Hence the Gospels for them are human books, coming in every respect under our literary standards, and if they are inspired it is only in the same way as Dante's *Divine Comedy* or Goethe's *Faust* may be called inspired. But, as a matter of fact, the question ought to be raised, for our holy books, although written under a special action of the Spirit of God, retain many traces of the mind of man which composed them : they belong to a people, to a period, to a language, and to a definite literary type. The

---

despite all the vicissitudes of transmission we faithfully possess in substance, in our actual printed text, the words which the evangelists gave to the world on their rolls of papyrus eighteen and a half centuries ago ". *Unsere Evangelien*, I, Freiburg i. B., 1919, p. 23.

human instrument, under the touch of the inspired artist, retains its own tone. And it vastly affects the understanding of a biblical book to know whether, for example, it is written in the prophetic style, and in what variety of this style; whether it is a work of edification or of doctrine; and whether or not it has reference to earlier sources, and if so, which. To this rule the Gospels cannot be an exception.

And immediately two alternatives present themselves between which we must first decide: can we speak in general of the Gospels as a fixed quantity, and seek, for the group of our four canonical books, antecedents or analogies in profane literature, or must we (as certain very plain signs would dispose us) treat the Synoptic group apart from the Fourth Gospel, or even deal with the first two Synoptists separately, Luke with his two books, and John, or even each of the writings separately? We here adopt, together with the immense majority of critics, the first course, believing (we shall see why further on) that the Johannine book, despite the profound differences which separate it from the others, is still a "gospel". All the same, it is in connection with the Synoptists that the literary character of the Gospels can and should be studied, inasmuch as they were the first to put in writing the Good Tidings of Jesus.

And then, can the Gospels be allotted to a literary type strictly defined, whether earlier or later?

It is to this question that a reply was attempted by the first authors who occupied themselves with finding in the Gospels analogies in the literary order, or with assigning them a definite rank amongst the different works in which history is related. But these attempts, at least those which are more than passing suggestions, do not reach a very high standard. Renan, in the two *Introductions* to his *Life of Jesus*,[1] and later in his book *L'Evangile*, came back several times to this subject, but without ever applying himself thoroughly to it. However, along with and on the same lines as others, he dallied with almost all the comparisons which had been considered anew and laboriously developed.[1] The famous yet very deceptive comparison between the Gospel story and the romance of Philostratus on Apollonius of Tyana[2] led many classical philologists to reflections by which their successors have been able to profit. But the investigation has only become scientific in the technical sense, and has only carved out for itself a special field in the vast domain of Christian origins, in the case of those works which are devoted to the literary forms of the most ancient writings connected with our religion. The discoveries which renewed the study of New Testament language (papyri, ostraka, and inscriptions) have much contributed to this by connecting once more this language, which till then had seemed to be limited by the bonds of classical Greek, with the popular tongue as it is written, outside literary circles, throughout the oriental world, Egypt, Syria, Asia, etc. Deissmann was the first, to my knowledge, to study the literary form of the epistles in our Canon [3] in comparison with letters written in common Greek. On the other hand, the efforts of the Comparativist School to find for the primitive Christian beliefs analogies or even origins in neighbouring religions, such as the Assyrian, the Egyptian, the Iranian, the Hellenic,[4] etc., naturally led to comparisons in the literary order between the various remains of these religions and our Gospels.

---

[1] *Introduction* to the 1st Ed.: *Preface* to the 13th Ed.

And with the lengthy treatise by Paul Wendland: *Les Formes littéraires dans le Christianisme ancien*, and the works of

---

[1] Not only the already classic "borrowing" of the materials for the life of Jesus from those of the life of Socrates (Plato and Xenophon), but also comparisons with the rabbinical collections, with the lives of the saints; with the *Lives* of the neo-Platonic philosophers (Plotinus and Proclus); with materials involving the origins of ancient Bhuddism and of Islam, and with various Franciscan *legends*, etc.

[2] *Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen* in the *Handbuch zum N.T.* by Hans Lietzmann, Tübingen, I, 3, 3rd Ed., 1912: *Die Hellenistisch-Roemische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, XI, p. 258 *seq.* On Apollonius of Tyana see Vol. II, Note P.

[3] *Licht vom Osten*, III, 1908; in the fourth edition, reset (Tübingen, 1923), *Die Bedeutung der neuentdeckten Texte für das literaturgeschichtliche Verstaendnis des Neuen Testaments*, pp. 116–213. Also J. H. Moulton in the *Prolegomena* of his *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh, 1886.

[4] The most influential of these, because it has been the starting point for others and has founded a school, is probably that of Gunkel, *Zum Religiongeschichtlichen Verstaendnis des N.T.*, Göttingen, 1903.

Heinrici,[1] Norden, Weiss, and many others, the problem has entered on the stage of methodical and detailed research. It is true that the majority of classical philologists have striven to restrict the field of investigation to works of Hellenic origin ; but other scholars, such as Paul Fiebig, Dalman, Wellhausen, Strack, Gressmann, and a host of others, have turned their attention to Semitic materials, without at the same time disdaining incursions into even more remote regions of Palestine.

Finally, a group of young German scholars, have, during the last ten years, set themselves the task not only of classifying the Gospels, but also of explaining their origin and determining their value, largely by the study of their literary form. The labours of these scholars, at first to a large extent faithful to the method of internal, documentary criticism, which was so popular at the beginning of the century, tend more and more towards independence, by the creation of a new method in which comparisons drawn from popular literature, analogies furnished by collective psychology and by sociology, and suggestions borrowed from liturgical worship, play a preponderant part.[2] Gunkel, the exegete and historian of religions, is, with Bousset (†1921), the favourite master of our young scholars. As a beginning, they rejected as tendentious the deductions drawn by their predecessors from the names most anciently given to the Christian writings. Thus, from the fact that St. Justin, in the middle of the second century, called them " reminiscences " and " memoirs of the apostles ", and that not once, but ten times and more, it was concluded, not without justice, that the old apologist considered the Gospels as related to the Hellenic works which bore that title.[1] He could judge wisely in the matter, and, in any case, his example deserves consideration, the more so as that title was anticipated by Papias, the earliest writer who has left us any teaching on the composition of the Gospels.[2] But no! These expressions are guilty in the eyes of Herr Schmidt of comparing the recollection of the apostles with the *Memorabilia* (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of Xenophon, which are direct recollections, first-hand testimony given as such by the author. Moreover they tend unduly to admit into the realm of literature works that are considered to be purely popular!

---

[1] *Der Literarische Charakter der neutestamentlichen Schriften*, 1908.

[2] Much space would be needed to give here a complete bibliography. The principal works, in what concerns the study of the Gospels, are those of Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 1919; K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, 1919; M. Albertz, *Die Synoptischen Streitgesprache*, 1921; R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 1921; and G. Bertram, *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christus-Kult*, 1922. Naturally, these scholars take their materials where they find them, notably in the works of Reitzenstein, Bousset, etc. The article by K. L. Schmidt, *Die Stellung der Evangelien in den allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte* in ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, *H. Gunkel . . . . dargebracht*, Göttingen, 1923, II, pp. 50–135, can be considered as the manifestation of the new tendency. I owe much to it,

The same reason leads him to reject as unworkable the comparisons attempted by various scholars between the Gospels and the Greek biographies of philosophers, such as the *Life of Pythagoras* by Diogenes Laertius, or that of Plotinus by Porphyry. Nor do the analogies sought in the works of Jewish origin, especially in the legend of the sage Ahikar, seem to be any more conclusive.

The ground having been thus cleared, Herr Schmidt passes on to the constructive, and much the most original, part of his essay. He strives to define the literary form to which the Gospels belong; for him and his friends, they are to be classed as popular writings, below the level of true literature, or, to borrow his own expression, as "small literature" as opposed to "great literature" (*Hoch- und Kleinliteratur*). He does not mean by that to deprive the former of all historical value; it is merely for him quite different to the latter. Negatively, by the anonymous character of its presentation, the complete neglect of topography and chronology (the notations of time and place are entirely arbitrary and dictated by the needs of the narrative), and of character drawing, and by the absence of construction and presentation even in what touches the hero of the history. Positively, it is different by reason of the close dependence of the author, or rather the compiler, on tradition ; and by the preponderance given to edification, to the marvellous, or to the interest of the narrative, over truly objective information. Finally, and above all, it differs through its spontaneous, collective and social character : the group, the community, and the setting playing the chief part in the creation of a uniform tradition.[1]

---

[1] Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, I, 2, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1889, p. 471 *seq.* After him Weiss sought to distinguish between "memoirs" and "reminiscences", and to show that the Gospels (ἀπομνημονεύματα) had been "reminiscences" and not "memoirs": *Das Urchristentum*, p. 538. τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν 'Αποστολῶν . . . ; τὰ . . . . ἀπ . . . ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, *I Apol.*, ch. lxvii, lxvi, etc.

[2] Mark wrote ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν; Papias, in Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 15.

Apart from that, it is considered that the analogies capable of throwing a true light on the elaboration, the historical and religious value, and the actual writing, of the Gospel traditions are to be sought in the formation, whether old or new, of analogous traditions, both those which are of a popular type : such as the Faust legend, or those which have developed from a historical nucleus, for example the history of the monks of Upper Egypt, Antony, Pachomius, etc., as told in the *Lausiac History* of Palladius[2] or (even better) in the *Apophthegmata Patrum*,[3] the primitive Franciscan cycle, or the Jewish revival in Galicia during the eighteenth century which gave rise to the sect of the Chasidim.[4] These examples, of very varying value, are complacently brought forward, and we are invited to seek in them, and in the history of similar spiritual movements, the characteristics which give us the key to the composition of the Gospels.

---

[1] I have here brought together the points given by Schmidt in *Die Stellung der Evangelien*, pp. 78, 88–89 (sociological character), 100 ("*das Volk als der Schoepfer der Ueberlieferung*"), 111, 117–118 *et passim*. See in the same sense the part attributed to the primitive Christian community by Bultmann: *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*, pp. 88, 21, 24 *seq.*, and see in the index *Gemeindebildungen* and the references. Dibelius, in his *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, gives greater emphasis to literature, notably to the *Theme*, and to the *Lives* of the philosophers.

[[2] Cf. *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, by Abbot Cuthbert Butler, Cambridge, 1898, for a critical examination of the work.—Tr.]

[3] Bousset in his last work, published after his death by Hermann and Kruger : *Apophthegmata, Studien zur Geschichte des altesten Moenchtums*, Tübingen, 1923, retraced (pp. 60–76) the history of this most valuable collection of sayings and anecdotes bearing on the Fathers of the desert of Scete, from the end of the fourth century to the Paradise of the Fathers (the end of the fifth, and beginning of the sixth, centuries). The comparison with our synoptic Gospels is on p. 77 *seq.*, and especially 90 *seq.*

[4] The initiator of the Chasidist movement (*chasid* means devout, pious), Baal Shem Tob, *the master of excellent* (*divine*) *name*, taught, about the year 1740, following in this matter the Kabbala, that a pious and virtuous man could enter by ecstasy into such a union with God that he would become a *Zaddik* (saint) capable of controlling the elements. Though it was very wide-spread towards the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century, Chasidism

All, indeed, is not to be rejected in these comparisons, and in the method which suggested their choice. It is, in fact, certain that concrete knowledge is indispensable for the control and completion of hypotheses based on a study and literary dissection of ancient documents ; and Herr Schmidt justly protects, at the end of his essay, against the critics of the preceding generation (such as Holtzmann and his school, Jülicher, etc.), who peremptorily decided that such a word could not have been said, or such an action performed, by Christ or his disciples. If the Faust legend is a singularly unfortunate example (and more than that : definitely conducive to error) precisely because it is a legend applying the earlier features of a classical type, and one copiously supplied with anecdotes (those of the magician who made an agreement with the devil), to a person of whom we scarcely even know the name ;[1] and if the history of the Chasidim is not much more instructive because the species of worship rendered by them to the *Zaddik* in his ecstasy has its explanation in the Kabbala, the other analogies presented, by Herr Schmidt amongst others, are of great interest. This is true of the history of the Fathers of the Desert because, while they were for the greater part related and passed on orally and in the Coptic tongue, they eventually became fixed in the Greek

---

has since been rolled back by orthodox Rabbinical Judaism. Its history was popularised by the Galician writer, Martin Buber, the descendent and biographer of Baal Schem. See in the *JE*, under *Hasidim*, VI, pp. 251–256. (The brothers Tharaud described the life of a community of Ukrainian Chasidim in their novel *Un Royaume de Dieu*, 1920). The principal source of the Kabbala and of Chasidist mysticism is the *Zohar* (Book of Splendour), a compilation formed about the beginning of the fourteenth century, perhaps in Spain, but including very diverse elements, some of them extremely ancient. See Gaster, *Zohar* in *ERE*, XII, 1921, pp. 858–862. The *Zohar* has been magnificently produced by Lafuma in a French translation by J. de Pauly, 6 vols., Paris, 1906–1911. [Parts of the *Zohar* translated into English are to be found in *The Kabbala Unveiled*, by S. L. MacGregor Mathers, London, 1887.—Tr.]

[1] See, for example, the Introduction to *Faust* by Henri Lichtenberger, Paris, 1920.

language by a process of transmission and composition which in many respects recalls those which brought the primitive Aramaic Christian tradition from its oral form to the state of the written Greek Gospel. And it is perhaps even truer of the history of Franciscan origins, because it concentrates on an essential person, a founder, whose acts and words have been collected by his disciples in a final purpose of edification and example, and with various particular designs.

But mere comparison is not reasoning. Even in the most favourable cases we must, if we are to be just, draw up side by side with the resemblances a list of differences. These, in truth, are numerous and far-reaching. The ascetic and hagiographical tradition of the Fathers of the Egyptian desert was developed and handed down by monastic communities animated by the same initial faith, guided by the same spirit, and visibly recruited in the same country. Moreover it is presented as the echo and commentary on the Christian doctrine, already existing and already rich, and resting upon the Gospels and on St. Paul. And it bears exclusively on spiritual matters—on a whole world to itself, no doubt, but a closed world excluding the conditions which, for the immense majority of men, react through the whole of life, even in spiritual matters. And the same must be said, in due proportion, of the touching and admirable history of the Franciscans or that of the other religious Orders.[1] What comparison can be established between the elaboration of particular cycles (grafted on a trunk already powerful and full of sap, and affecting only a chosen homogeneous group, relatively few in number) and the tradition of the Gospel? This last possessed from the beginning a power of novelty, of expansion, and (I venture to say) of immeasurable explosive force. Read again what Paul, sure of being understood and followed, wrote of the Master, thirty years after the Passion, to the Corinthians whom he had instructed, to the Romans whom he had never seen, to the Galatians whom he rebuked, and to the Philippians whom he praised ! Go back to the *Apocalypse* of John, to the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, and to the *Acts of the Apostles*. In these will be found a control which enables us to judge of the force of the evangelical leaven. It led men of every race and of every spiritual origin, Greeks, Syrians, Romans, proselytes, Israelites, and pagans, to a complete revision of their spiritual values. It forbad all division, whether with Jupiter or Cæsar ; it put the one outside the Synagogue, the other outside their worship, which was totally united in the adoration of a Jew, " crucified under Pontius Pilate ".

---

[1] With even more reason must this be said of the legendary (as distinct from the real) and yet very interesting history of St. Patrick. See the Introduction to *The Life of St. Patrick and his place in History*, by J. B. Bury, London, 1905, and (with much caution) *Le Culte des Héros et ses conditions sociales : Saint Patrick, Héros national de l'Irlande*, by G. Czarnowski, Paris, 1919.

The suggested analogies, and others, have, then, a real significance ; in particular they help us to understand how a collection of memories, stories, and sayings, at first varied and confused, could eventually form a unity, which, if not literary in the technical sense of the word, was at least real and organic ; and how a form of teaching conceived, collected and passed on in one tongue, could yet pass into another without losing its primitive accent. But we must guard against unduly pressing these parallels, which only careful choosing and grave omissions allow to be pushed a certain distance.[1]

---

[1] It is plain that an analogous formation evolving under our eyes would permit us to explain, in the case of the living, processes of composition to which we instinctively apply our literary categories. It is in the case of people of an oral tendency that we would without doubt find the best opportunity for making this study. But the illustration of the Synoptic problem which Dr. Streeter has attempted to draw from the manner in which he himself and A. J. Appasamy have gathered together the spiritual doctrine of Sadhu Sundar Singh (see *The Four Gospels*, pp. 191–195: *A modern illustration*), seems to be in every respect unfortunate. This is not the place in which to discuss the man in question; I have done that elsewhere: *Le Sadhu Sundar Singh* in *RSR*, XII, 1922, pp. 1–9. And since then, investigations made on the spot have shaken certain facts which I had admitted to a provisional title of historicity. See in particular H. Sierp, *Sadhu Sundar Singh* in *Stimmen der Zeit*, CVII, 1924, pp. 415–425 and Heiler's reply: *Apostel oder Betrüger-Dokumente zum Sadhustreit*, Munich, 1925. But the analogy, as clearing up the problem of the composition of the Synoptists, is very far-fetched. Dr. Streeter and his collaborator have proceeded in a leisurely manner, following the established method and consulting the Sadhu himself. It seems, however, that Dr. Streeter, in his appreciation of the facts, has too much neglected the atmosphere and the way of thinking and speaking proper to India. There is too great a distance between these methods, at once remote and scientific, and the evangelic manner.

This principle is at the root of the very conception we must have of our Gospels. Do they belong to popular literature, are they collective, impersonal, absolutely uninterested in all chronology and in every geographical frame-work into which we would like to fit them? Are they in reality, as Schmidt maintains, "popular books used for purposes of worship, or rather books for worship which have become popular"?[1] We must in the first place protest against the intolerable simplification of what is the object of debate. The Third, the First, and even the Fourth Gospel, *are*, as Herr Schmidt admits, Gospels. Are they, from the literary point of view, purely and simply assimilable to the Second?——Certainly not. Now, it is with this last-named as the standard (previously dissected and reduced to its alleged "primitive" elements by means of an extremely hazardous analysis—sometimes entirely subjective) that the others are compared in this system. It is on the Second Gospel that the formula is based. But, whatever literary character (or preliterary, or subliterary, or superliterary) must be attributed to St. Mark's Gospel—and even on this point there is much ground for discussion[2]—the First and the Third Gospels are assuredly books written with a special purpose; the First, in the Semitic manner, but, in its own way, powerfully and subtly;[3] and St. Luke's rather after the Greek manner, but in any case with strictly biographical and objectives aims.[4] Therefore it is much too accommodating to fix, not merely in accordance with the Second Gospel standing alone but with the primitive elements of Mark, discovered by way of divination, the essential features of the literary type to which the Gospels belong! By this method three-quarters of what properly constitutes the Gospel of Jesus is left out of account.

---

[1] "Die Evangelien sind kultische Volksbücher oder auch volkstumliche Kultbücher": *Die Stellung der Evangelien*, etc., p. 124.

[2] Bousset himself, in his last work, brought this into striking but, to my mind, excessive, relief: "The Gospel of Mark is and remains a Greek Gospel; a previous Aramaic Mark is a dream and a phantasy. Only a Greek, or in this case a Jew who had received a Greek education, would have had the literary talent and the modelling power necessary for the writing of a *Life of Jesus*, etc." (*Apophthegmata*, Tübingen, 1923, p. 90). I believe that Bousset underrates the capacity of a Jew to compose a book in biographical form (the First Gospel is the proof); but the fact remains (as he has well realised) that our Second Gospel is by no means the spontaneous product of a popular formation. It is the work of an *author*; it is a *book*.

[3] See below, pp. 65–67.

[4] See below, p. 82 *seq.* This literary character which is more visible to us in the Third Gospel, because it separates us less than the First from our own ways of writing and composing, makes this Gospel a favourite with classical philologists applying themselves to exegesis, as for example Ed. Meyer, who in *Ursprung und Anfaenge*, I, 1921, p. 1 *seq.*; III, 1923, p. 1 *seq.*, defines the work of

Having said that, we are glad to recognise that there are in the new school's picture many features which, if not new, are at least well-founded. The Gospel stories have in fact a popular and liturgical character. Themselves anonymous, they were written with a view to edification and instruction, and not for the sake of art or of disinterested information. In no way (an indubitably archaistic feature) is the physical person of Jesus described in them; and in no way are his virtues enumerated or his dignities celebrated. So also the relatively abundant notes of place and time are too distant for them all to have the same significance, as we shall see in due course. But these features should not be urged to the exclusion of any order, or choice of material for a fixed purpose. Now this order and this discrimination are precisely what make a work personal. The creative power of a community, if it is not to be absolutely denied, should not be invoked without great caution. Frequently it is dragged in as a convenient agent; all kinds of activities are allotted to it; but an attentive study reduces it to its possibilities. It does act, undoubtedly, and acts powerfully, in a religious movement such as was primitive Christianity, but after the manner of a heated, stimulating atmosphere propitious for the formation of strong feelings and enthusiastic expressions: it never supplies the personal agents in the creation of definite ambitions and of fixed aims. These are intellectual works which the wealth of feeling in collective life favours but does not create.

---

Luke, the *Gospel* and the *Acts*, as a literary unity of the historic order, " the acts of the Lord Jesus " (III, p. 6), and compares it to the soundest and most considerable historical works both ancient and modern. And for the same reason those who hold to the popular, spontaneous and liturgical origin of the Gospels, such as K. L. Schmidt, speak of St. Luke with ill-disguised impatience: *Die Stellung der Evangelien*, pp. 89, 133 *seq.*

Now these characteristics which only exist to the smallest degree in popular literature, in the ordinary sense of the word (and whether they are pious or profane the element of discernment and discrimination in them is practically non-existent, originality being in such cases content with facts, with statements, and with amorphous developments, decked out with digressions and drifting haphazardly into repetitions and reminiscences)—these characteristics are, on the contrary, powerfully emphasised in the Gospels: as much in the second Gospel as in the others. Herr Schmidt somewhere expresses astonishment that Père Delehaye, the astute critic of hagiographical legends, has not had the idea of applying this same criticism equally freely to the study of the Gospels. He has not done so, precisely because the case is quite different! Whereas in much of the Golden Legend and in stories of the saints secondary features abound—stereotyped miracles, series of insupportable torments, flagrant anachronisms, and utterly improbable ways of speaking, etc.[1]—in our Gospels, on the other hand, everything is real, living, and without emphasis or overloading. The element of the marvellous enters into the narrative, indeed, but not from the desire of the narrator, much less from that of the principal agent. In this matter we are at the very opposite extreme to folklore. The phrases, instead of being conventional, or affected, or bearing the marks of a previous original, are strong, new, and sometimes so unexpected as almost to give offence; and to attribute a notable part of them to the spontaneous creation of the community expressing itself through the prophets is to go contrary to all semblance of truth. Can we imagine that innovations in such a matter could have passed without check and without protest? Paul plainly distinguishes (and wishes all to see the distinction) between what is "the word of the Lord" and his own teaching even though given in the spirit. The words of Jesus were from the beginning sacred and set the standard. But without this antecedent probability, we have in the *Didache*, in the first letter of St. Clement of Rome, and elsewhere, very ancient fragments of Christian origin and liturgical use ; and certainly there is no comparison possible between these venerable documents and the words of Jesus, the outpourings, counsels, replies, parables, which fill our Gospels. The former are a reflection ; in the latter we see a conception and a personality without an equal. " A manner of radiancy at once gentle and terrible, a divine force, if I dare say it, underlies these sayings, detaches them from the context, and makes them easily recognisable to the critic."[1]

---

[1] H. Delehaye, *Les Legendes hagiographiques*, Brussels, 1905, Ch. III and VI; and especially *Les Passions des Martyrs et les Genres littéraires*, Brussels, 1921, Ch. II and III (*Les Panégyriques*, *Les Passions épiques*). In the same connection we may consult the *Etudes* of Dufourcq on the *Gesta Martyrum Romanorum*, Paris, 1900–1910.

But, furthermore, these admirable passages are inserted in a consistent plot, these diamonds are not rolled about at the hazard of a capricious stream. When one sets oneself, as Dibelius and Bultmann have done, to the preliminary breaking up of the Gospels into literary atoms—apophthegms of three kinds (polemical, pedagogical, and biographical) ; prophetic, apocalyptic, and legal *logia* ; commentaries that are self-assertive, parabolical, and allegorical ; miraculous stories of cures and vocations ; together with narratives and legends[2]—one can imagine that by this analysis one has probed the Gospel matter to the bottom, and nothing is easier than to insert these dispersed members into their antecedent setting, and to form them into a mosaic or a compilation. But when after that we re-read the Gospels, whether *Mark*, *Matthew*, or *Luke*, we perceive that a body stretched out on a dissecting-table is one thing, and a living man another. Order reappears, the more real as it is the less sought after, and as it displays the outstanding lines of the career of Jesus, and is, in fact, natural. The grouping of events and of teaching is perhaps governed by reasons of doctrine and of edification, and is very different to that which a chronicler or a professional historian would adopt, but it none the less exists, and in no sense is the thread broken or unduly stretched. In that brief sketch of an immense subject, everything works towards an end and has a significance; a human person lives, speaks, suffers, labours, and dies before our eyes.

---

[1] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, lxxxi.

[2] I have copied Bultmann's list, *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*, p. 230.

The liturgical character in our texts, so insistently stressed by the scholars of the new school, should also not be pressed unnaturally. It is obvious that, from the very earliest times, the Gospels served a liturgical purpose; but the independence of Christian worship was only established by degrees,[1] apart from the essential rite of the "breaking of bread": for the rest it no doubt modelled itself on the services in the synagogue, in which the reading of the Bible played a prominent part. But at what time was the reading of "the apostolic writings which we call the Gospels" and of St. Paul's letters added to the reading of the Old Testament? It is impossible to say exactly, but it is in other respects certain that in the Pauline and apostolic communities (it must never be forgotten that Cephas and Apollos were authorities at Antioch, Ephesus, and Corinth; and that Christian communities of considerable size, such as that at Rome, existed outside all Pauline influence) the worship of Jesus was already powerful and relatively complete, when the Synoptic Gospels were not yet in writing. They were, in reference to this liturgical development, at once later in point of time, and very much more primitive in the tone and the human and temporal limitations which they show in the action of the Master. They represented a stage more ancient than that of the Churches to whose collective influence some would attribute their partial composition.

What, then, is the position of our Gospels in general literature? How must they be classified? In truth, they inaugurate and form by themselves[2] a new type in the field of doctrinal and apologetical biography; a type which nothing else resembles, even among works which were equally intended to make known and to appraise a religious founder.[1] At bottom, the real characteristics peculiar to the Gospels are, together with the complete submission of the author to his subject, the constant fusion, in the religious and moral statement, of the person with the teaching of Jesus, and finally, the constant presumption that in order to obtain the desired effect it suffices to recount or to reproduce exactly the sayings and actions of the Saviour, which do everything of themselves and show themselves unalterable. The Gospels, then, are less apologies than epiphanies: they aim at nourishing the faith, at communicating it as a vital contagion, and of developing its pre-existing germ in those who are capable and worthy of receiving it. It is not a pleading, but an exposition, a traditional and incomplete summing-up of the Good Tidings. The study of each of these writings will justify, while diversifying and completing, these general considerations.

---

[1] See *Les Origines du Culte Chrétien*, by L. Duchesne, a book which is still unsurpassed.

[2] For those gospels which are called apocryphal, even the oldest of them, such as *The Gospel of Peter*, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, etc., so far as they are any more than glosses on the canonical books, fall largely into the category of pious legends, characterised by the features so excellently pointed out by Père Delehaye.

---

[1] Even in the ancient Buddhist books, at least those of authentic monastic Buddhism; for in them all worship, even that rendered to Buddha, is in contradiction with the dogma: "The conquest of Nirvàna is a strictly personal task. In this the monk cannot be aided either by a god, or by a Buddha, even if the latter were Sakya: 'Be your own lamp'." This, however, does not hinder devotion to Buddha, the *bhakti* of Buddha, being acceptable and desirable, even in the case of monks; but it is "a moral and intellectual hygiene", a means, a *recipe* that is very useful for putting them on the road to salvation. "There is no *latria*, but *dulia*, or *hyperdulia*." But there remains a consequence, a capital difference: for the observant Buddhist, salvation is taught by Buddha, but it is not *in him*. For the Christian, on the other hand, for Peter, Paul, John, Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus, *salvation is in Jesus* and "No other Name is given to men whereby we may be saved". I have borrowed these passages which are so much to the point from L. de La Vallée Poussin: *Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens: l'Inde jusque vers* 300 *avant J-C.*, Paris, 1924, p. 335 *seq.*

Nor is the Koran any more comparable to the Gospels. It is, so far as it is a source of history, an *autobiography* of the Prophet. It professes, moreover, to be not merely inspired, but integrally revealed: everything in it is the word of God Mohamed's part in its composition being supposed to be purely passive and instrumental. In reality, it is dominated (especially for the Medina portion) by a constant opportunism, springing from the personal needs of the Prophet and those of his community. See in Noeldeke-Schwally, *Geschichte des Qorans*, Leipzig, II, 1919, p. 119 *seq.*: *Der muhammedanische Kanon in seinem Verhaeltnis zum christlich-jüdischer.* Finally, in its religious content, the Koran has very little originality: "Mohamed was so dependent on these religions (Judaism and Christianity) that there is hardly a religious thought in the Koran which was not borrowed from them". *Ibid.*, p. 121; H. Lammens, *L'Islam*, Beyrouth, 1926, pp. 43–63.

From the literary point of view, the Gospels are for the greater part of their contents (I mean, not merely in their Aramaic sources, but in their actual Greek form) much more Hebraic than Hellenic. They were composed by Jews, or by men whom the assiduous reading of the Septuagint had imbued, as in the case of Luke, with Jewish ways of thinking and expressing themselves, and had even affected their oral style in general.[1]

The Greek transcriptions of the sayings of Jesus, and even a great number of the narrative portions, whether they be the work of interpreters trained for this task or whether they were hellenised by the actual writer who has preserved them for us, are literal copies much more than free adaptations. They do not exclude a touching-up of the sense and of expressions, but their framework is solidly established by rhythmic processes which are not æsthetic or poetic, in the modern sense, but utilitarian, physiological, and less intended to embellish the matter than to assure to it, by mnemonic supports, exact and complete transmission.

And it is not to the strophes, the cadences, the methods of composition, and the literary forms of the Greeks (even those which were popular) that they must be chiefly compared, but rather to the Jewish rhythms, and to the habits of thought and language of the Jewish leaders. Subsidiarily they may be compared to the stereotyped recitations by the masters of the oral style who are still numerous amongst many peoples : the improvisors of the Arabs, Berbers, Afghans, and Merinas of Madagascar, the Basque pastoral singers, and the illiterate yet cultivated guslars of the Yugoslav districts, etc. It is the oral transmission and the subsequent writing down of these recitals, together with their translation into a different tongue (without forgetting that, in the case of the Gospels, the distance between these processes was lessened by the hellenisation of the Bible during the Jewish dispersion, especially at Alexandria) which can furnish us with instructive analogies and really fruitful suggestions.[1]

---

[1] See below, Note C, p. 203.

The Gospel of Jesus was first given in preaching, not in our present style, in which the literal text matters little (since, if it is desired to publish it, there is always the opportunity of revising the words and of polishing the style), but in the ancient manner of the prophets. With them, an oral speech was often *written out*, as an unchangeable text, not for the expressions of detail, which the faultless and richly stored memory of the improvisor will produce almost automatically, but for the rhythmic divisions, the essential words on which the discourse turns, the refrains, and the mnemonic appeals. In it, in fact, the speaker strove to engrave a doctrine, with its characteristic features (as friends of the memory), its verbal repetitions (which help to preserve the sense), and the rich variety of its metaphors, not on tables of stone, but on the living tables of a man's heart. And so, in this system, the repetition of the same doctrine under various forms and analogies, far from repelling, becomes almost a necessity : it gives full value to the changing reflections of a precious stone ; to borrow the metaphor of André Chénier's Greek, it " displays the material of holy melodies ". And there we have a likely explanation (without having recourse to the expedient of improbable literary corrections) of the presence in the Gospels of versions of the same fact, and the same development,[2] which are similar, even partly identical, and yet have distinct differences.

---

[1] On all this matter consult the work of Marcel Jousse, *Le Style oral rythmique et mnémotechnique chez les Verbo-moteurs, études de psychologie linguistique*, Paris, 1925; and *Études*, Vol. CXLIII, pp. 685–706. On the improvisations of the Berbers and the Taitoqs in particular, see the beautiful work of Père Charles de Foucauld and M. Henri Basset.

[2] The theme of the Beatitudes, for example, treated orally, gives quite naturally the two statements inserted in our First and Third Gospels: the one more solemn and purely Judaic, the other more general, more contrasted and more logical. But if, on the other hand, we try to establish a relation of literal dependence between the two texts, the Greek translator of St. Matthew being thought to have " softened " and developed the cruder and more archaic words of St. Luke, or the latter being supposed to have condensed and " sharpened " St. Matthew's version against the powerful, whoever they might be, we come up against objections which a very small attack from the higher criticism can make insuperable. Many other parallel passages would give rise to analogous observations.

These generalities, which it has not been possible for us to omit, receive all their meaning from a study of each of our Gospels.

Even a superficial reading of the four Gospels leads to their classification in two groups, the second of which is formed solely by the Gospel of St. John. It differs profoundly from the others by reason of the mystical spirit which continuously animates it, by its preoccupation with doctrine, its frame-work, its very personal style, and by the greater part of its contents. This fact did not escape the notice of the early Christians. As early as Clement of Alexandria we find the "spiritual" character of the Johannine narrative stressed; and Eusebius, in the course of his careful comparison between the Gospels[1], which he divided into sections (those which treat of the same subject being compared), stated that, out of 1162 sections, only 74 were common to the four evangelists, and that out of 355 sections in *Matthew* only 62 were peculiar to it and original, (the same applying to 19 out of *Mark's* 233 sections), while *John* had 106 out of 232 peculiar to itself.

### D. *The Synoptic Gospels*

The first three Gospels are called *synoptic* (a name which has been current since at least the time of J. Griesbach,[2] i.e. c. 1776) because it is possible as a rule to place the three versions in parallel columns and so to take in with a single glance (synopsis) the triple view which they give us of the same evangelical fact. It is with a study of them that we must begin. After having described the character of each of these writings,[1] we shall compare them with one another in order to discover their historical value as sources for the life of Jesus.

---

[1] A critical text of the letter to Carpianus, in which Eusebius explains his plan, has been published, with the canons in detail, by Nestle, at the beginning of his edition of the New Testament; the canons alone in the first Graeco-Latin edition (1906), both letter and canons in the 7th Greek edition (1908). See *Novum Testamentum graece et latine* cum cur. Eb. Nestle, Stuttgart, 1921, pp. ix, xi, xvi.

[2] His *Synopsis Evangeliorum* certainly seems to have introduced the expression, or at least to have made it general.

### I. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW

Our first Gospel, that according to St. Matthew, enjoyed a sort of primacy in the early Church ; it is beyond comparison the most frequently quoted, and the most widely annotated.[2] Moreover, it regularly occupied the first place in the list of evangelical writings, and the tradition which attributes it to the apostle Matthew, one of the Twelve,[3] is general and undisputed. Accordingly the rare details that have been passed down to us concerning its composition do not bear on its origin, but on the language in which it was first composed, on the time of its being committed to writing,[4] and on those to whom it was originally addressed, together with details of its contents.

According to Irenaeus, Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia during the first part of the second century, " an old man who had heard John, and had been a companion of Polycarp ", wrote five books of *Explanations on the Oracles of the Lord.* Eusebius, who passes on the words of Irenaeus to us, displays reserve on the second point (" who had heard John ") and on the extent of the insight of the old Phrygian bishop ; but at the same time he places great reliance on his affirmations in matters of fact. Also he took care to transcribe several of them for us. Thus he writes of the first Gospel : " Such were the remarks of Papias concerning Mark ; on

---

[1] We shall naturally join to St. Luke's *Gospel* the " Second Discourse " of the same writer, *The Acts of the Apostles.*

[2] See *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, 1909, p. 76: " The parallelism (in the epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch) is much closer to *Matthew* than to *Mark* or *Luke;* a remarkable phenomenon, but one which we frequently encounter in the most ancient literature of the sub-apostolic age ". Dr. Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 511) says that: " Ignatius and the author of the *Didache* stand to *Matthew* as the preacher to his text ".

[3] *Mt.* ix, 9; x, 3; *Mark* and *Luke* call him Levi at the time of his calling by Jesus: *Mk.* ii, 14; *Lk.* v, 27.

[4] The chief passages have been collected by A. H. McNeile in *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, London, 1915, pp. xxx–xxxii; and more completely by Père Lagrange, *Evangile selon saint Matthieu*, vi–xix.

Matthew this is what he says: 'As for Matthew, he placed the Oracles in order, in the Hebrew tongue, and everyone translated them as well as he could'."[1]

Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, John Chrysostom, Ephraem and the most ancient Syriac manuscripts, Jerome, and Augustine, all, without one discordant voice, confirm this essential teaching on the entire Gospel, in whatever way they may express themselves in other respects.[2] Recently, in defiance of all probability, and not without violence to the texts,[3] an attempt has been made to show that this imposing measure of agreement rests solely on the passage in Papias. In this we have an example of those extreme minimising tactics which we shall have so often to denounce.

All the ancient witnesses agree in telling us that St. Matthew's Gospel was aimed at the Jews; it was amongst them that he composed it on behalf of those of them who believed[4] and against the others.[5] The only date handed down to us for its composition is approximate. Matthew wrote, says St. Irenaeus, " when Peter and Paul were evangelising Rome and founding the Church ",[1] which would bring us to the years preceding the persecution by Nero (64).

---

[1] *Ματθαῖος μέν ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος* Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 16. *Συνετάξατο* is, as opposed to *συνεγράψατο*, the reading given by the great majority of the best manuscripts (5 out of 7) adopted by Schwartz (*CB*, I, p. 292).

[2] *Ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ* (Irenaeus); *γράμμασιν ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον* (Origen); *πατρίῳ γλώττῃ*; *ἑβραΐδι γλώττῃ* (Eusebius); *hebraicis literis verbisque* (Jerome), etc. The vaguest translation: "in the Jewish tongue", would be the safest. The Fathers certainly did not mean to indicate *Hebrew*, in opposition to Aramaic for example, or ancient Syriac, but *the language of the Hebrews* (and most probably in reference to a book) as then spoken, that is to say Aramaic. Lagrange justly remarks that St. Paul, when he addressed the Jews of Jerusalem *τῇ ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ* (*Acts* xxi, 40), certainly spoke in Aramaic, "the only language which could be understood by all" (*S. Matthieu*, p. xix). But this fact does not necessarily decide the question whether Matthew first *wrote* in Aramaic or in Palestinian Hebrew. Cladder brings forward in support of the latter hypothesis reasons which while not to be despised are yet not convincing. (*Unsere Evangelien*, I, 1919, pp. 73–78.) The Aramaic Gospel of St. Matthew was quickly lost (if it was ever completely written), because many of the Jews much preferred oral tradition to any books.

[3] Notably those of Origen: *Comment. in Matt.* i, 1 (in Eusebius, *HE*, VI, 25, 3) *ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθών* · · · *Ματθαῖον ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασιν, γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον*; *Comment. in Jn.* vi, 32, *ὅς* [*Ματθαῖος*] *και παραδέδοται πρῶτος τῶν λοιπῶν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐκδεδωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* The three accounts (Matthew wrote first, for the Hebrews, in the Hebrew tongue) are given, as we see, as traditional, and under the same title. Now there is no trace of the first two in the passage from Papias, and for none of them does Origen have recourse to the latter.

[4] See the text of Origen in the above note; also Eusebius, *HE*, III, 24, 6.

[5] *Πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἐγράφη*; Irenaeus, frag. 29.

Finally, Papias mentions a characteristic feature of the work : unlike Mark, who (according to the earlier testimony of the Phrygian bishop) has given us everything that he could recall concerning the Saviour, acts and words, but without placing them in order, Matthew " arranged in their order the Oracles of the Lord ".[2]

If in order to check and, at need, to complete these accounts, we pass to a direct examination of the work, certain features strike us at once. The most obvious of these is the Judaical nature of the book. Matthew himself drew attention to it when he spoke of the " scribe perfectly instructed in all that concerned the Kingdom of heaven ", and capable in consequence of drawing from his treasure things both new and old.[1]

---

[1] *ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιξομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, *Adv. Haer.*, III, 1, 1, the Greek is in Eusebius, *HE*, V, 8, 2. The Latin of Rufinus has these words (they are not in the Latin version of Irenaeus): *cum Petrus et Paulus . . . ecclesiae inibi fundamenta solidarent.*

The quotations from this Gospel in the Apostolic Fathers are not exact. In general they are not sufficiently literal to prove any literary dependence. But there is one such to be found in St. Ignatius's *Epistle to the Smyrnæans*, I, 1; *Matt.* iii, 15.

[2] Μάρκος · · · · *ἀκριβως ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι ταξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθεντα* · · · · *Ματθαῖος μὲν ἑβραΐδι διαλεκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο*, in Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 15–16. If it were permissible to take sides in a note, on a question which has divided so many first-rate scholars, we would say that it is adding to the text to make it say anything else. Papias has in view, in the account which he gives us, the part of the work of Matthew on which he has commented in five books, the Oracles of the Lord, i.e. the discourses of Jesus (Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 1, 2, " We know of five books by Papias entitled *Explanations of the Oracles of the Lord* . . . Irenaeus mentions them thus: Papias, in the *Preface* to his work, etc. . . ."). These *Oracles* are written in Hebrew and arranged as a consecutive sermon; they are not scattered as in *Mark*. This last view is in accord with the manner of the discourse in our actual Greek Gospel of St. Matthew. On the other hand, Eusebius, who had in his hands the work of Papias, made extracts from it, and referred thither those " desirous of information " (*ibid.*, n. 14), had not the smallest suspicion that the author reduced the first Gospel to the " Oracles " which he expounds through the medium of oral tradition (*ibid.*, n. 3, 4.).

The suggestion of modern writers who explain the division of the *Explanation* of Papias into *five* books by referring to the *five* great discourses of Christ reported in *Matthew*, is a pure conjecture, but one which is not without probability.

As regards the old, that which concerns the religion, the spiritual outlook, the manners, the customs, and the language of the educated rabbis of his time, none of the New Testament writers knew more than he himself. His work is Jewish to the backbone and, we may say, to its very marrow. Without this clue nothing in it is intelligible, its allusions, its vocabulary, its literary mannerisms, its narrow horizon, its method of argument, or its controversies. From the very beginning we are plunged into the atmosphere of the Old Testament: "The Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham"[2] and the whole genealogy, deliberately simplified, which follows: "So all the generations, from Abraham to David are fourteen generations. And from David to the transmigration of Babylon are fourteen generations: and from the transmigration of Babylon to Christ are fourteen generations."

And this Christ is the Messias, the son of David, foretold by the Prophets. He comes to preach the Kingdom of Heaven;[3] he comes to fulfil the Law, not to abolish it;[4] He is sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel;[5] he condemns neither the ceremonial side of the Law,[1] nor the observance of the Sabbath.[2] He does not even dispute the authority of the Scribes when it is contained within just limits;[3] and the reward of his faithful disciples will be that "when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory" they also "shall be seated, judging the twelve tribes of Israel".[4]

---

[1] *Mt.* xiii, 52. See Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1920, p. 255

[2] *Mt.* i, 1.

[3] The Kingdom of Heaven, synonymous with the Kingdom of God, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is only to be found in Matthew, where it occurs thirty-two times. "Heaven" (*heavens* in Hebrew and Aramaic, in which languages the word does not exist in the singular) was one of the respectful synonyms used for the divine name, *Jahveh*, which the Jews scrupled to pronounce: See Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, I, Leipzig, 1898, p. 75 *seq.*, and, on the rabbinical custom, *KTM*, I, pp. 172-184. On the other equivalent terms used, especially *Adonai* and *Memra Adonai*, *Shekina*, etc., *ibid.*, II, pp. 311 *seq.* In the *Pirké Aboth* the most frequently used synonym is *Makom* (the Place, i.e. the Omnipresent). It may be that the word *heaven*, in this expression and in those which are analogous ("Our Father who art in heaven", etc.) has a more precise shade of meaning, referring to the place and the state of things in which the will of God, meeting with no obstacles, is perfectly and completely exercised. It is clear, in any case, that the expression is deeply rooted in Jewish ideas and customs; that is why the other evangelists restrict themselves to the *Kingdom of God*, which is intelligible to all.

[4] *Mt.* v, 17–20.

[5] *Mt.* xv, 24.

It was for these twelve tribes, in fact, that the book was written. Its readers are presumed to be familiar with the history of God's people, with the language of the prophets, and with the Palestinian customs of the time. They know "what was said to the ancients"; they are more familiar with the whole gamut of rabbinical judgments, "of the tribunal, of the sanhedrim, and of gehenna", than the most learned modern exegete, and know, as well as he knows, the form and the shape of the characters of Hebrew writing.[5] Nor are they ignorant of any of the ruses by which they can, under colour of piety, refuse to help their aged parents or swear without thereby committing themselves irretrievably.[6] There is no need to explain to them what is meant by "an adulterous generation,"[7] a proselyte, or "a child of hell".[8]

So also they can equally well appreciate as connoisseurs that art,[9] immemorial among the Jews, of developing the leading idea through opposition and parallelism, and then establishing it by a kind of rhythmic cantilena or ballad which stresses certain salient words. Veritable landmarks of verbal development, these words sharpen the memory, and almost automatically bring to the lips of the reciter a given passage or antithesis. They made possible for the scribes of those days, as for the oriental story-tellers of all time, feats of improvisation and of recitation which our analytical methods make not only difficult, but almost incredible to us.

---

[1] *Mt.* xxiii, 23: "These things you ought to have done [the great duties of justice, mercy, and piety which are *τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου*] and not to leave those [the smaller legal observances] undone". I would hesitate to join to these texts those (vii, 23; xxiii, 41) in which the *ἀνομία* is condemned, although the terminology is worthy of note.

[2] *Mt.* xxiv, 20: "Pray that your flight (from the calamities to come) be not in the winter or on the Sabbath".

[3] *Mt.* xxiii, 2: "The scribes and the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you [in this capacity], observe and do . . .".

[4] *Mt.* xix, 28.

[5] *Mt.* v, 19, 21, 22.

[6] *Mt.* xxiii, 18–23.

[7] *Γενεὰ μοιχαλὶς*, *Mt.* xii, 39; xvi, 4. *Adulterous* because unfaithful to the alliance of Jahveh with his people: *Is.* i, 21; *Jer.* iii, 9; ix, 3; *Ezech.* xxiii, 37, etc.

[8] *Mt.* xxiii, 15.

[9] See below, Note C, p. 203.

Suggested on almost every page of the New Testament, and easily discernible by those who have once made themselves sensible of them, these rhythms are especially numerous in St. Matthew's gospel. In it they, as it were, run neck and neck with the text, and to point them out it would be necessary to transcribe whole chapters. From the beginning the sermons of Jesus bore this stamp, and probably they were passed on by the Master in person to the ears and the lips of his disciples without change.

Another Semitic mannerism, related to the first, consisted in distributing the matter in a certain number of fixed frames, in groups of two, three, five, seven, or ten. Such arrangements, intended to help the memory and also, no doubt, sought for their own sakes, are to be found throughout this gospel :[1] in the narrative portion no less than in the discourses. A case in point occurs in chapter ii, in which the story of the Magi and the subsequent events down to the return from Egypt are distributed in three sections each of which is begun by a genitive absolute (ii, 1, 13, 19) ; the first two are in their turn divided into two paragraphs beginning with the same words : "Then Herod" (7, 16) ; and the essential climax (the departure of the Magi by another route, frustrating the evil design of Herod and exciting his rage) is stressed by a characteristic key-word which acts as a link between the two halves of the story (12, 13).[1]

---

[1] See in this connection the commentary by Plummer, who has taken care to underline this feature in detail. C. W. Allen in *A Critical . . . Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, Edinburgh, 1912, p. lxv, enumerates twenty-six groups of three. See also E. von Dobschütz: *Paarung und Dreiung in der evangelischen Ueberlieferung*, in *N. T. Studien G. Heinrici . . . dargebracht*, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 92–101. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1921, says: "It would be altogether a mistake to refer these parallels to a mythical *motif*. It is a popular *motif* in the story, supplying a need for symmetry" (p. 191).

But if there is nothing in the Gospel that would seem foreign to a Jewish reader, the whole of it gives him occasion for serious, even moving, reflection. For true as it is that the Messias "came to his own," it is equally true, if we consider them in their leaders and in their mass, that "his own received him not." And on this scandal, this infidelity, no one insisted so much as St. Matthew. His gospel is like the book which a mysterious hand offered to Ezechiel: "And behold . . . he spread it before me. And it was written within and without: and there were written in it lamentations and canticles and woe."[2] Peace to the Israel of God which recognised its Messias and chanted "Hosanna to the Son of David!" But woe to the rest! When we look at the Gospel to-day, we see in it from beginning to end, like the watermark in a sheet of paper, the tragic story of God's appeal made to all the people, and heard only by the elect, obeyed by a minority comparable to the "holy remnant" so often spoken of by the prophets of old. So is it true of Israel at this critical hour: "Many are called, but few are chosen"![3] But for all that, the divine plan will not be frustrated; in place of the sons of the Kingdom, those invited from outside will sit at the Messianic Feast.[4]

It is significant that the genealogical table which sketches in broad outline the story of the race of Abraham and of David mentions only those women who were sinners, all of them foreigners: Rahab the Chananite, Ruth the Moabite, and the wife of Urias the Hittite. And even in his cradle Jesus was recognised by the wise pagans who had come out of the East, while the prince of his people pursued him. At the beginning of the public life of the Saviour the temptations of the Evil One take the form of the popular Messianic expectations which closed so many eyes to the pure light of the Christ. And all the way through the Sermon on the Mount, which was the charter of the New Kingdom, the Gospel stands in contrast to the human traditions which were then dominant in Israel. The miracles worked by Jesus suffice for men of good will, notably for the pagan centurion, more faithful than the Jews, and the true son of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob;[1] but they are a dead letter for the leaders of the people, the Scribes and the Pharisees. Like infidels, these demand prodigies, "signs in the heavens", contrary to the designs of God. The towns where their influence prevails are the most hard-hearted and will receive more severe treatment than Sodom and Gomorrha. And worse still, they attribute the divine works of Christ to the Prince of Devils, and the simple are deceived by this sinister device. Wretched people, who verify the prophecy of Isaias:

---

[1] *δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ ἀνεχώρησαν εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν. 'Αναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν,* etc. We do not here labour a point which is admitted by all.

[2] *Ezech.* ii, 9.

[3] *Mt.* xx, 16; xxii, 14. This very striking aspect of the Gospel has been well brought out by Cladder, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 33–36.

[4] *Mt.* xxii, 1–14.

> Hearing, you shall hear and shall not understand,
> And seeing, you shall see and shall not perceive.
> For the heart of this people is grown gross,
> And with their ears they have been dull of hearing,
> And their eyes they have shut;
> Lest at any time they should see with their eyes
> And hear with their ears,
> And understand with their heart and be converted,
> And I should heal them.[2]

Moreover, the inner meaning of the parables is understood only within the apostolic circle, and only a handful of men recognise in Jesus "the Christ, the Son of the Living God". And from thence onwards there is the road to the abyss foretold in the Master's prophecies, in which the princes of the people, the leaders, and the learned, are ever seen taking part against him and delivering him over to the Gentiles. And this is the clearly-expressed message of those last days: "the first shall be last"—the sons of the Kingdom shall be supplanted by heathens come from the four quarters of the earth. Woe to the Pharisees, "the blind leading the blind"! Woe to the false shepherds, to the husbandmen who exceed even the malice of their fathers by slaying the Heir of the chosen vineyard! The corner-stone which these wicked labourers reject will fall upon them and crush them. But first they will have their hour, for the Scriptures must be fulfilled. Jesus accordingly is condemned by Pilate, but behind the Roman there is the chief culprit, and he is not the only Judas. Just as guilty are the leaders of this mob, and it is "all the people" who cry out: "Let his blood be upon us, and upon our children!"[1]

---

[1] *Mt.* viii, 5–14. [2] *Mt.* xiii, 14–15.

Nor are the apparitions of the risen Christ for those who are excluded from the Kingdom. In their place, the last page of the Gospel shows us, in conformity with the sayings of the prophets, the Gentiles evangelised and the Israel of God expanded to the stars.

And all this pathetic history is told in a manner worthy of its subject. When we speak of history it is not in order to drag in a comparison with the classic types of literature: apophthegms, memoirs, lives, and themes are of little assistance here,[2] for this book, written in sufficiently good everyday Greek,[3] is in no way hellenised. But if it is perhaps useless to search for the models our author set before himself, or to discover whether he had any models at all, it is, on the other hand, easy to see what he has done. No complete biography, no mere collection of maxims and edifying anecdotes, the Gospel presents the elements of a sufficiently adequate

---

[1] *Mt.* xxvii, 25.

[2] But see the splendid study by Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon saint Matthieu*, pp. cxxiv *seq.* But the theory of Dibelius, for example, who reconstructs (*die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Tübingen, 1919) the whole genesis of our actual Gospels, departing from the hypothesis of fixed literary types, evolving from the simple to the complex, certainly seems artificial.

[3] J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, II, 1, p. 29: "The language is a correct if rather colourless Greek which avoids the vulgar forms without displaying a mastery of the literary syntax."

Christian initiation. It replies to the questions which a Palestinian Jew of the period before the great catastrophe in A.D. 70 would, if he were touched by the apostolic preaching, naturally put to himself on the person of Jesus, the essentials of his message, and the reception given to this message by Israel.

Considered from this point of view, the work is admirable. It is not only, as all admit, the most complete of our Gospels, but it is also the best balanced. We must break a lance on that point with the prejudices dominant in the schools of liberal exegesis, which have engendered, together with unwary research and an abuse of critical dissections, a desire to accentuate even to contradiction the conflict between what is called the Judaizing Matthew and the Catholic Matthew. That view cannot be accepted, for, despite, and partly by reason of, that conflict, which divides the evangelist between his love of his race and his clear view of the changing economy which is substituting a new people for the Israel of the flesh, the unity of the narrative is profound. There is unity of feeling, as we have seen above, and, still more, there is literary unity.

Adopting, after the story of the divine Infancy, the order which the general preaching had fixed from the beginning in its main lines, concerning what happened "through all Judea, beginning with Galilee, after the baptism which John preached: how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power",[1] the author divides the message of Christ into two equal parts.[2] The first contains the ministry in Galilee up to the journey to Jerusalem on the eve of the Passion; the second, all the rest to the end. Each is introduced by the same formula[3]: "From this time forward Jesus began to preach" (or "to show"). Peter's confession is the hinge and marks the decisive turning-point, at once local, historical, and spiritual, of the public life of the Saviour.[4]

---

[1] *Acts*, x, 37, 38 (Peter's speech); cf. xiii, 25 (Paul's sermon).

[2] From iv, 17 to xvi, 20; from xvi, 21 to xxviii, 20; twelve chapters to each.

[3] Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρύσσειν (δεικνύειν, xvi, 21).

[4] *Mt.*, xvi, 13–21.

Within these great epitomes, Matthew subordinates chronology to his plan of exposition and demonstration.[1] This plan is very clear: the chief "oracles of the Lord" on a given matter are grouped and ordered in five (virtually six)[2] discourses, three in the first part, and two (virtually three) in the second. Each of these discourses is provided with an introduction which prepares the way for it, and with a characteristic stereotyped ending.[3]

Each is followed by a series of "works of Christ", *τά ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*,[4] which comment on it. And these signs, which are marvels of power, but also of goodness and of wisdom, make him who performs them sufficiently recognisable as the Chosen of God, the Messias foretold by the prophets, the King of the New Kingdom.

### 2. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

The second Gospel of our canonical collection, that according to St. Mark, will not occupy us for so long. While it was left to some extent in the shade by the early Christians (no doubt on account of the small extent of its original contribution, as distinct from details of wording),[5] among our contemporaries, on the contrary, it enjoys the privilege of being the most favoured of the Gospels.

---

[1] This was noticed long ago by the great Maldonatus in connection with the parable of the marriage ceremony of the King's son (in *Mt.*, xxii, 1): *Non fuit illi* [*Matthaeo*] *curae historiam ut gesta erat texere, sed Christi doctrinam exponere*, Ed. Mussiponti, 1596, col. 509.

[2] The Five Discourses are: (*a*) The moral plan of the Kingdom (the Sermon on the Mount): v, 1 to vii, 27; (*b*) the instructions to the apostles sent out to preach: ix, 36 to xi, 1; (*c*) the parables on the Kingdom: xiii, 1 to xiii, 53; (*d*) the practice of the Christian virtues: xviii, 1 to xix, 1; (*e*) the Last Things: xxiii, 1 to xxvi, 1. This last discourse is virtually double, being divided at xxiv, 1. However, it is permissible to join them, the idea of the Last Things being already hinted at in xxiii, 34–39 and the *πάντας* of xxvi, 1 inviting one to extend the scope of the last.

[3] *Καί ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους*, vii, 28; xix, 1.
*διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα*, xi, 1.
*τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας*, xiii, 53.
*πάντας τούς λόγους τούτους*, xxvi, 1.
It goes without saying that these divisions, which, taken in general, are indisputable, can no more be interpreted according to our classical canons than the stichs of the Gospel rhythms can be cut up into a regular number of feet or syllables.

[4] *Mt.*, xi, 2.

[5] Of the 106 sections into which Swete divides this Gospel (excluding the conclusion and the title), only 3 are absolutely original; of the other 103, 96 are roughly common with *Matthew* and 82 with *Luke*. (*The Gospel according to St.*

On the composition and the aim of the book we have authoritative evidence, of which the earliest and the most complete has been preserved by Eusebius,[1] and precedes the short mention of the first Gospel which we have given above. Papias of Hierapolis writes, then, about the year 125:

> "It is well also that the Elder says: 'Mark, who had been Peter's interpreter, wrote down exactly, but without placing it in order, all that he could remember of the words and actions of the Lord.' For he had not himself heard the Lord, nor had he been His disciple, but later on he was, as I have said, the disciple of Peter. Now Peter delivered his discourses as need arose, but without troubling to place in consecutive order the oracles of the Lord. Thus Mark is not to be blamed for only having written certain things, so far as he remembered.[2] He only cared about one thing: not to omit anything that he had heard, and not to put in anything which was untrue."

This information, which, through the ancient testimony adduced by Papias, takes us back in essentials to the first century, is fundamental. Others add a little to it, but without making the matter any clearer. The earliest and the most considerable of these offer details on the date and the cir-

---

*Mark*, 1920, London, pp. lxvi–lxxv). One of the very few ancient commentators on *Mark* (the most interesting is the author of the Commentary inserted in the *Spuria* of St. Jerome's works, *ML*, 30, 390–644. Cf. Dom Morin: *Un commentaire romain sur saint Marc de la première moitié du Ve siècle*, *Rev. Benedictine*, xxvii, 1910, pp. 352 *seq.*), Bruno d'Asti (†1125), declares that the commentary will not cause him much trouble, "*quoniam valde pauca ibi dicuntur quae in Matthaeo exposita non sint*": *Comment. in Marcum*, *Praef.*, *ML*, CLXV, 313.

[1] *HE*, III, 39, 15. We follow, as always, the text of Schwartz.

[2] Renan translates this, rather freely, but quite in the spirit of the passage: "Mark is no way at fault if he only wrote a small amount, just as he remembered": *Les Evangiles*, p. 127. *Ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν* does not mean that Mark "wrote certain things as he remembered them", but that he wrote *only* certain things, and as he remembered them. It seems more probable that Papias's words begin at "For he had not" etc., the "as I have said" being less naturally explained as the Elder's.

cumstances of its composition which at first appear to be in mutual conflict. Thus St. Irenaeus (about 180) tells us:

> "after their death [that of Peter and Paul], Mark, Peter's disciple and interpreter, himself also left us, in writing, the preaching of Peter".[1]

On the other hand, a fragment of a lost manuscript by Clement of Alexandria, dating from about 200, says that Peter's Roman audience, ravished by his doctrine, wished to possess it in writing. Accordingly they put

> "all sorts of pressure on Mark (the author of the Gospel and the disciple of Peter) that he should leave them in writing, as a memorial, the teaching which they had received by the voice [of Peter]. Nor would they cease till they had obtained it, and thus they were the cause of the writing of the Gospel according to Mark. It has been said that the apostle, knowing by a revelation of the Spirit what had been done, rejoiced at the zeal of these people and approved the reading of the book in the churches".[2]

Eusebius also sums up thus another passage in the same work by Clement, concerning the composition of this gospel:

> "While Peter was publicly preaching the word of God in Rome, and expounding the Gospel under the inspiration of the Spirit, his numerous hearers besought Mark (as a man who had long accompanied Peter and remembered his teaching) to put in writing what the latter had said. Mark did so and gave the Gospel to those who had begged for it. And when Peter knew of this, he did not make any comment, either to dissuade him from this course, or to encourage him in it."[3]

---

[1] *Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε.* *Adv. Haer.*, iii, 1, i. Ἔξοδος here clearly means their death; "in addition" alludes to the other evangelists of whom Irenaeus speaks. See below, Note G, p. 228.

[2] The *Sixth Hypotyposis* of Clement in Eusebius, *HE*, II, 15, 1–2.

[3] *HE*, VI, 14.

And a third fragment by Clement, taken from a lost commentary on the first Epistle of St. Peter, also shows us Mark responding to the wishes of the apostle's hearers, by putting in writing his master's teaching.[1] Now these notices, which are in agreement in placing the writing of the Gospel during the lifetime of Peter, contradict on this point the testimony of Irenaeus, which is about twenty years older. Moreover, the first passage contains an extravagant detail, which is given only as hearsay ;[2] while the second is presented in a context which does not enhance the critical value of its source.[3]

But these remarks do not seem to us to discredit the essentials of the story. Nothing was more probable, or more in conformity with the spirit of the apostolic age, than the expectant attitude attributed to Peter by those from whom Clement received his information. "The Gospel" meant at that time oral preaching, "the living and faithful voice"; and Peter could not light-heartedly see it hardened into a rigid version, and one necessarily incomplete. However, the desire of his hearers was eminently natural, and the reduction of the Gospel to writing must come sooner or later. Accordingly Peter let the matter alone, and, without encouraging his disciple, he did not disapprove of it. Then, when he had seen the first copies, he realized that the enthusiasm of his flock had been inspired, and he allowed the written version to be publicly read.

As for the contradiction which exists between our two authorities with regard to the date of the written version, materially it is indisputable. But to profit by it to the extent of proclaiming the total incompatibility of the two versions seems the result of a somewhat absolute and pedantic conception. In this matter Clement's account is in accord with the probabilities and (Irenaeus excepted) with all the ancient witnesses ; while on the other hand, the object of the Bishop of Lyons in the passage quoted is much less to fix a point of literary history, than to point out the apostolic origin of the Gospels according to Mark and Luke, though the teaching which they represent (that of Peter and of Paul) might not have been edited by the two apostles and may therefore be, in comparison with them, secondary and later.[1]

---

[1] Ed. by Stahlin in the *CB*, III, p. 206: *Marcus Petri sectator, praedicante Petro evangelium palam Romae coram quibusdam Caesareanis equitibus et multa Christi testimonia proferente, petitus ab eis ut possent quae dicebantur memoriae commendare, scripsit ex his quae a Petro dicta sunt, evangelium quod secundum Marcum vocitatur.*"

[2] "It is said that the Apostle, having learnt by a revelation of the Spirit what had been done . . ."

[3] The information is attributed to "the tradition of the presbyters of old", τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων, who are made to say that the genealogical Gospels (*Matthew* and *Luke*) were written before the others!

All ancient tradition (we have only mentioned the witnesses who are nearest to the actual beginnings of Christianity) agrees in naming as author of this Gospel a man whom various fortunate side-lights enable us to identify with a probability which approaches certainty.[2] The texts which concern him show him to have been a good subordinate, a "useful man", confined to lesser duties, but in their performance rendering incomparable, though far from striking, services. The son of one of the earliest Christians in Jerusalem, Mary, he first appears in the movements of Barnabas and Paul, whose assistant he was as far as Perge of Pamphylia. Having by his sudden and, in Paul's eyes, unjustifiable departure, caused friction between the two missionaries, Mark, during the second apostolic expedition, followed his cousin to Cyprus. But about 61 we find him at Rome quite restored to the good graces of Paul, now a captive, who estimates his services very highly.[1] It was also at Rome, some years later, that Peter in his paternal affection made mention of him [2] and finally it was there that, as the intimate secretary, disciple, and interpreter of the old apostle, he put his Gospel into writing.

---

[1] See below, Note G. It is to be observed, moreover, that the indications given us by Irenaeus and by Clement send us back in actual fact to *almost identical* dates, if we admit, with almost all the critics, that the second Gospel is earlier than the catastrophe of the year 70. The Alexandrian details, compared with the allusion to Mark in *I Peter*, v. 13 (ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου) take us back in fact to the last sojourn of Peter in Rome, in 62, or a little later; the death (ἔξοδος) of the two apostles, according to all probability, would be between 64 and 67, dates accepted by Duchesne (*Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, I, p. 61) and Lightfoot. Harnack, urging the text of St. Clement of Rome (*I Cor.*, 6), makes the two apostles die in 64. Swete would reverse the order, and would willingly admit that Peter was the second of the two to die, perhaps alone in 68 (*The Gospel according to St. Mark*, pp. xxi–xxii. See also Hans Lietzmann: *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, Bonn, 1915, Berlin, 1927). Prat inclines to the separation of the two martyrdoms, and accepts, as more probable, for the death of St. Paul, the year 67 (*Saint Paul*, p. 194 *seq*). Whatever opinion we adopt, the difference between the statement of Clement (about 62–64) and that of Irenaeus (about 65 or 67–69) is very small.

[2] The chief of these side-lights is the text of *Col.* iv. 10, where Paul describes Mark (of whom he also speaks in *Philem.* 24, and *II Tim.* iv, 11) as "cousin of Barnabas", Μάρκος ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα. Now we know from *Acts* that John, son of Mary of Jerusalem, and surnamed Mark (*Acts* xii, 12 and 25), was particularly dear to Barnabas, so much so that the latter took his part against Paul when he separated from him (*Acts* xv, 36–40). Barnabas then set out for Cyprus with Mark, and Paul for Syria with Silas. (On the meaning of ἀνεψιός see Lightfoot's note: *Colossians*, p. 236 seq.).

If it is much the shortest of the four Gospels, St. Mark's book does not owe its brevity to the suppression of details or to conciseness in its style. Quite the contrary. Of the three Synoptists, as a glance at any harmony of the Gospels will prove, it ordinarily includes the most details and is the richest in pleonastic expressions.[3]

[1] *Philem.* 24; *Col.* iv, 11. In these Mark is described as one of his fellow-labourers, συνεργοί, and one of those of whom Paul says "these only are my helpers, μόνοι συνεργοί, who have been a comfort to me." Elsewhere, *II Tim.* iv, 11, he declares Mark to be "profitable to me for the ministry", εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν. Possibly we may read into these allusions a shade of regret for his previous severity.

[2] *I Peter*, v, 13. "The Church that is in Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you. And so doth my son, Mark." We plainly cannot doubt that Babylon here means Rome, in conformity with a figure of speech to which the Apocalypse gives the clue. Even the liberal critics, who oppose feeble reasons to the authenticity of the epistle while at the same time recognising its undoubted antiquity (e.g. R. Knopf, in *RGG*, III, 1912, col. 1018–1020), admit that the author here means to signify Rome, for "all Christianity knows that Peter before his end had come to Rome and that he died there." *Ibid.* col. 1020.

As for the description of his "son", ὁ υἱός μου, it may very well refer to the fact that, as the son of one of the earliest Christians, the hostess of the Church of Jerusalem during the worst days, John Mark had almost certainly been received into the Church by Peter at the same time as his mother, *Acts*, xii, 12–18.

According to an old tradition, mentioned as early as St. Hippolytus (*Philos.* vii, 30), Mark had had a slight infirmity of his fingers (κολοβοδάκτυλος) about which we can only conjecture.

[3] As regards details, compare for example the accounts in chapter v (the demoniac of Gerasa, the cure of the woman with the issue of blood, and the raising to life of Jairus's daughter) with the same incidents in *Matthew* viii and ix, and *Luke* viii. Pleonastic expressions recur on almost every page, whether by way of repetition—"immediately with haste" (vi, 25), "I neither know nor understand what thou sayest" (xiv, 68)—or by way of insistence—"she had suffered many things from many physicians and had spent all that she had; and was nothing the better, but rather worse" (v, 26), "and his garments became

But, besides the fact that it contains nothing on the Infancy of Jesus, his account gives few of the teachings of the Master, and these, with one exception,[1] not arranged as a discourse. It is not a *life* of Christ; for that there is lacking the *recul.* the continuation (apart from its essential outlines), and above all the intention. It is an epitome, an *aide-mémoire* for the missionary, furnishing the theme and the matter of the "Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God".[2] The author writes with authority for readers already convinced, or very nearly convinced, who already know in the main the essentials of his message.[3] His work is not apologetical, he does not discuss, nor does he indicate his sources like St. Luke. So, too, he goes back less often to the ancient prophecies than St. Matthew, and he does not exploit them. It is enough for him to display Jesus: the words of the Master carry their own weight, and his actions manifest him. It is by the effect produced and reflected, so to speak, in the bewilderment of the disciples, in the admiration and the astonishment of

---

shining and exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller upon earth can make white" (ix, 2), "an alabaster box of ointment of precious spikenard" (xiv, 3), etc.

Westcott has remarked (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 560) that there is perhaps no incident mentioned by both St. Mark and St. Matthew or St. Luke, in which the first does not add some characteristic feature.

[1] xiii, 5–37.

[2] These last words υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ are absent, we know, from some of the best sources including ℵ and the so-called Koridethi MS. Θ (O 38, Gregory; O 50, von Soden). But besides the fact that the great mass of the others (including B, A, D, the better miniscules and the quasi-unanimity of the versions) is preponderant, these words merely anticipate the formal and repeated teaching of the Gospel: i, 11; iii, 11; v, 7; ix, 7; xii, 6; xiii, 32; xiv, 61; xv. 39. See also C. H. Turner: *A Textual Commentary on Mark I*, in *JTS*, XXVIII, 1927, p. 150.

[The Koridethi manuscript, which dates from between the seventh and ninth centuries, and was discovered in the Monastery of Koridethi on the Black Sea Coast, is now at Tiflis, and has been edited by G. Beerman and C. R. Gregory: *Die Koridethi Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1913: cf. Burkitt: *W and Θ; Studies in the Western Text of St. Mark*, *JTS*, XVII, pp. 1–21; 139–152.—Tr.]

[3] On this point, see in its latest form the opinion of the most penetrating of the liberal commentators on Mark, Johannes Weiss (*Das älteste Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1916, 1903; *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 3rd ed., Göttingen, 1916, I, *Die drei älteren Evangelien; Das Urchristentum*, 537–549): "the reader, as the author sees him, is already conversant with at least the main features of the life of Jesus: the Baptist (i, 4), Pilate (xv, 2) and Jesus Himself (i, 9), are introduced as persons already known." *Ibid.*, p. 539.

the crowds,[1] that the conclusion is emphasised.[2] The saying of the centurion on Calvary is characteristic of the author: "And the centurion who stood over against him, seeing that crying out in this manner he had given up the ghost, said: Indeed this man was the son of God!"[3]

The readers expected by the author were not Palestinian, nor probably, as regards the majority, even of Jewish origin, but rather of those proselytes who formed for the synagogues of the Dispersion an outside following, and one freer in its views. It is frankly explained to them that the Jordan is a river;[4] that Bartimaeus means "son of Timaeus";[5] that such are "the customs of the Pharisees *and of all the Jews*".[6] The author nowhere names himself, and hardly a single detail escapes him which would allow of a guess at his identity.[7]

---

[1] "And they were astonished at (the tone of) his doctrine, for he was teaching them as one having power", (i, 22); "and the disciples were astonished at his words", and after a first explanation they "wondered the more, saying among themselves", etc. (x, 24–26). Examples of this are innumerable, and are couched in the strong expressions beloved by the author: *θαμβεῖσθαι, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, ἐκπλήσσεσθαι.*

[2] "In matters of psychology and characterisation, the very things in which a modern narrative gives itself free rein, ancient literature is reserved and full of modesty. *Mark* avoids direct characterisation, just like *Genesis* and Herodotus. The character of the persons is gathered indirectly from their conduct, and from their words; and the words are given concisely and in the direct style (the people were not familiar with the indirect style) interspersed with reflections (*Gedanken*, ii, 7; v, 28; xi, 31; xii, 6); for with the simple to think is to speak. All the light is concentrated on the person of Jesus; and in comparison with him the other characters are only supernumeraries." Paul Wendland: *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum, Die Urchristliche Literaturformen*, p. 271.

Mark is very fond of precision and especially of numbers, contrary to the custom of antiquity, which preferred (as more dignified) general indications. Cf. C. H. Turner, *Marcan Usage*, VI, in *JTS*, XXVI, 1925, p. 338: "That Mark is fond of numerals is then a matter of fact which this instalment of my Notes is intended to prove. . . . But that is only one side of the argument. The other side is that the natural tendency of an educated writer of ancient times would be to omit numbers. For that assertion I am glad to be able to base myself on the testimony of Père H. Delehaye: '*les procédés de la rhétorique des anciens les amenaient à ne pas multiplier les noms de personnes et de lieux, à éviter de donner des chiffres exacts.*' Persons, places, numbers: Mark is no rhetorician and is full of all three."

[3] *Mk.* xv, 39.

[4] *Mk.* i, 5.

[5] *Mk.* x, 46.

[6] *Mk.* vii, 3–5.

[7] Many have pointed to the episode in Gethsemane as such a detail: Jesus being taken and having been abandoned by his followers, "a certain young man fol-

But the tradition which he passes on is that of a witness of the earliest days, a Galilean, manly and rough in speech, observant, and one who is impulsive and somewhat impatient in character : all features which perfectly accord with the presumed source of the Gospel, the teaching of Peter.

We have in this Gospel only a loose chronological thread, often non-existent, despite numerous citations of hours ; no careful narrative, expressed by the delicate play of Greek particles, but a series of concrete facts, juxtaposed, rather than joined, by the Semitic *and*, or the popular *at once*, or both.[1] We find here living words, as it were punched out, crudely related, without any care to prevent wrong glosses ;[2] and there are attitudes hit off with precision, as well as striking summaries, while other scenes are underlined with a certain satisfaction.[3]

---

lowed him, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body. And they laid hold on him. But he, casting off the linen cloth, fled from them naked" (*Mk.* xiv, 51–52). Is this trifling incident, which is manifestly authentic, a personal recollection by the evangelist who dwelt in Jerusalem and was then *νεανίσκος*? It is an ingenious conjecture, but only a conjecture.

[1] *καὶ εὐθύς*, repeated to satiety in the first chapters; as many as eight times in twenty verses: 1, 9, 12, 18, 21, 23, 29, 31. Weiss (in ΕΥΘΥΣ *bei Marcus*, in *ZNTW*, xi, 1910, pp. 124–133) disputes the authenticity of several, relying on a turn of phrase that is fairly frequent in the Syriac versions.

[2] "And sighing deeply in spirit he (Jesus) saith: Why doth this generation seek a sign? Amen, I say to you, [may I die] if a sign is given to this generation!" [In the Douay Version: "Amen, I say to you, a sign shall not be given to this generation."—Tr.] (*Mk.* viii, 12)—on the imprecatory form of negation, which is a hebraism, see the comments and examples in *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, by Swete, p. 168. "Why callest thou me good? None is good but one, that is God." (*Mk.* x, 18). "But of that day or hour [of the judgment] no man knoweth; neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father." (*Mk.* xiii, 32).

[3] *Summaries:* "And immediately the Spirit drove him out into the desert; and he was in the desert forty days and forty nights, and was tempted by Satan. And he was with beasts . . ." (*Mk.* i, 13). "And forthwith he called them [James and John]. And leaving their father Zebedee in the ship with his hired men, they followed him." (*Mk.* i, 20). "And sending away the multitude, they [the disciples] take him even as he was in the ship" (*Mk.* iv. 36), etc.

*Pictures:* The curing of the first possessed man, and the effect produced on those standing round, (*Mk.* i, 23–28); the resurrection of Jairus's daughter, with the actual words used by Jesus: *Talitha cumi*, and the picture of the child: she "immediately rose up and walked, *and she was twelve years old*" (*Mk.* v, 40–43); the action of James and John, who begin their request after the fashion of children: "Master, we desire that whatsoever we shall ask, thou wouldst do it for us" (*Mk.* x, 35), etc.

And over and above all, the attitudes of Jesus : his gaze, piercing and sometimes severe, or else infinitely gentle[1]; his countenance, his indignation, his astonishment.[2] And the picture of the Master which results from these touches, which are in no way harmonised, is impressive, and vivid with life.[3]

But these characteristics, so strongly marked in the Galilaean narratives, become (with the exception of the rough freedom of the language) weaker in the last part. Once he reaches Jerusalem, the Gospel becomes more circumstantial, and has more numerous local indications. No doubt " the hand of the writer to whom we owe the first great section of the book is clearly to be seen in the last. Yet there is a change of manner which is perhaps not wholly due to the difference of theme."[4] In brief, while we certainly conclude that the principal source for the Gospel was the teaching of Peter (almost exclusively for the ministry in Galilee, and chiefly for the remainder) " we should probably leave open the question of the use of other authorities, of which some may have been in writing, especially in the last six chapters." No one could be surprised if John Mark, himself a native of Jerusalem, possessed information of his own for this part of his Gospel.

---

[1] " And looking round about on them with anger, being grieved for the blindness of their hearts, he saith . . ." (*Mk.* iii, 5); " And looking up to heaven, he groaned and said to him *Ephphatha,* which is, Be thou opened " (*Mk.* vii, 34); " And Jesus looking on him (*having looked into his eyes,* ἐμβλέψας) loved him " (*Mk.* x, 21), etc.

[2] " And when he was come into the house from the multitude, his disciples asked him the parable. And he saith: to them; " So are you also without knowledge? Understand you not, etc.", (*Mk.* xii, 17). On another occasion, Jesus, knowing their preoccupation, " saith to them: Why do you reason because you have no bread? Do you not yet know nor understand? Have you still your heart blinded? Having eyes, see you not? And having ears, hear you not?" (*Mk.* viii, 17–18). " And embracing them [the little children] and laying his hands upon them, he blessed them " (*Mk.* x, 16); " And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem: and Jesus went before them. And they [the Twelve] were astonished, and those who followed [the women and the other disciples] were afraid. [But the Douai version has: " And they were astonished and following were afraid "—Tr.] And taking again the Twelve, he began to tell them the things that should befall him. Saying: Behold we go up to Jerusalem " etc., (*Mk.* x, 32–33); " And he could not do any miracles there, only that he cured a few that were sick, laying his hands upon them. And he wondered because of their unbelief " (*Mk.* vi, 5–6).

[3] Weiss, stressing the tone at the end, of the Gospel says: " impetuous, heroic, passionate, disquieting ", *Literaturgeschichte des N.T.*, in *RGG*, III, 1922, col. 2191.

[4] Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, pp. lxi–lxv. Numerous details of grammar, of vocabulary, and of historical facts support this important observation, which seems to me to be well founded, and suggests (without, of course, proving) the hypothesis of a final editing, made perhaps at Jerusalem, by Mark, of a work originally written at Rome in the lifetime of Peter.

### 3. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE

The third of our Gospels, the "first discourse" of Luke, has many advantages. It is accompanied in the New Testament by a "second discourse" by the same author which extends the ground for possible comparisons and verifications;[1] it is preceded by a Prologue in which the author indicates his sources and lays down his plan; and it is written in a style which made Renan exclaim: "It is the most beautiful book that has ever been written".[2]

But the ancient writers who name as its author Luke, the physician and the disciple of St. Paul, are not earlier than the third quarter of the second century, and we owe our knowledge of them to St. Irenaeus and to the unknown author of the list of books received in the Church which bears (after its fortunate discoverer in the eighteenth century) the title of the *Canon of Muratori.*[3] But before exploring these, it is convenient to note that we can, as it happens, approach many of the sources by a double road which is indirect but very certain.

---

[1] A large number of these verifications, made on the spot, have been collected in the works of Sir William Ramsay, notably in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Oxford, 1895, 1897; *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D.* 170, London, 1893; and *The Bearing of recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, London, 1919.

See also, Alfred Wikenhausen, *Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert*, Münster, 1921; and Louis Pirot, *Les Actes des Apôtres et la Commission biblique*, Paris, 1919; and *DBVS*, I, 42–86.

[2] *Les Évangiles*, p. 283.

[3] On the Muratorian Canon, cf. Harnack: *Ueber den Verfasser und den literarischen Charakter des Muratorischen Fragments*, in *ZNTW*, XXIV, 1925, pp. 1–17. The canon may be the work of Hippolytus, as Lightfoot and Zahn consider; but it may also (and more probably) be the work of a Pope, either Zephyrine (198–217) or Victor (189–198), more probably Victor (p. 15); in any case it is of Roman origin. It is an authoritative document for all Christendom. Lagrange (*RB*, XXXV, 1926, pp. 83–88) is in favour of Hippolytus, "and probably as antipope" (p. 88).

The book of the Acts, which is undoubtedly a continuation of the Gospel, contains considerable fragments, amounting to about one tenth of the whole work,[1] written in the first person plural. These are generally known as the *We* sections (in German: *Wirstücke*, and in French: *Fragments Nous*), and they are, as is generally admitted, pages of the diary of a journey kept by a companion of St. Paul. Now their study, from the point of view of grammar and style, and their comparison with the rest of the Acts and with the third Gospel, do not permit us to see in them a document inserted in the narrative by a later editor. The man who wrote the *We* sections is the same man as he who wrote the two books to Theophilus. This conclusion, which had been anticipated by a fair number of exegetes, was placed beyond all doubt by Sir John Hawkins in his justly celebrated *Horæ Synopticae*.[2]

After him, V. H. Stanton[3] and Harnack[4] took up the question from a larger point of view. "The conclusions, for reasons which are ever growing surer and firmer, are that the writer who was an eye-witness to the later facts recorded in the *Acts* was also the author of the whole work",[5] and therefore of the Third Gospel. In fact the peculiarities of vocabulary and style in the author of the two Lucan books are in no way more numerous, or more crowded into a smaller space, than in the *We* sections. Moreover they are just as marked in those passages of the document which have a particular interest and end, as in the banal portions or the transitions which the editor would have, according to the other hypothesis, more easily rewritten in his own particular style. This fact receives worthy recognition, with new proofs to support it, from the greatest expert on the language of the New Testament, J. H. Moulton,[1] and even from our adversaries also. These latter back out of the matter by general affirmations, or by singularly precarious evasions.[2] Of course it goes without saying that we do not attribute an incontestable probative value to this argument alone, which is delicate to manipulate and is concerned with internal criticism. None the less it brings to the unanimous tradition of antiquity[3] a confirmation which is singularly opportune.

---

[1] *Acts*, xvi, 10–17; xx, 5–15; xxi, 1–18; the whole of xxvii; xxviii, 1–16. The text of these fragments has been published, with a typographical device which emphasises the characteristic expressions common to these passages and to the writings of Luke (the Third Gospel, and the rest of the *Acts*) and otherwise not to be found in the New Testament: *Beitraege zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, by Harnack, Leipzig, 1911, Vol. IV, pp. 3–9.

[2] Oxford, 1899; 1909. These admirable studies, distinguished by their acuteness and critical penetration, have long passed unnoticed in Germany, as Harnack complains (*Beitraege*, Vol. I, p. 19, note 3). On this point, however, Sir John had had a German predecessor in Auguste Klostermann, whose *Vindiciae Lucanae* had appeared in 1866.

[3] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Cambridge, 1909, II, pp. 240–260; 276–322. See also, on the objections offered to the thesis, the same author's article: *Style and Authorship in the Acts of the Apostles*, in the *JTS*, XXIV, 1923, pp. 361–382.

[4] *Lukas der Arzt*, 1906; *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1908; *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1911. These three studies form Vols. I, II, and IV of the *Beitraege zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament.*

[5] Lagrange: *Évangile selon saint Luc*, Paris, 1921, p. ix.

Among the witnesses to this tradition, before even Irenaeus and the author of the Muratorian Canon, mention must also be made of the heresiarch Marcion, whose powerful personality filled the years immediately preceding the middle of the second century. Born during the first century, about 85, at Sinope on the Black Sea, probably in a Christian family, he arrived at Rome in the first year of the Emperor Antoninus Pius (138) on one of his ships, and, with hands by no means empty, " the Black Sea captain "[4] very soon began to dogmatize. He opposed the Christian Scriptures to the Jewish Scriptures, and applied to the Old Testament the Gospel parables of the new wine and the old bottles, and of the unfruitful tree. Unmasked, and chased from the Church, he adhered to his opinions, which he erected into a system, and began an intensive propaganda; so that by 150 "St. Justin records the universal diffusion of the Marcionite sect".[1] We are not here concerned with his doctrines, but simply with noting the fact that, having to justify them, Marcion, who took as the primary basis of his doctrine only the anti-Judaising texts in *Galatians*, repeatedly acknowledged as alone authorised in the Church, our four canonical Gospels. Of these four versions, two were rejected by him as Judaising and as having been in consequence falsely attributed to the apostles: those of Matthew and John. Of the two others, the heretic only admitted that of Luke, the disciple of Paul; and after having expurgated it, according to his *a priori* standards of criticism, with a cool audacity resembling that of certain modern critics, he adopted it as one of the bases of his church, the other being those ten of Paul's Epistles which he accepted. The Book of the Antitheses, of which (thanks to Marcion's adversaries) we are able to reconstruct the general plan and many of the actual passages, was nothing but a passionate commentary and a biassed gloss on these two fundamental authorities.[2]

---

[1] *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 14, note 1; p. 216 *seq.*; and Vol II, 1, Ed. by W. F. Howard, Edinburgh, 1919, p. 7: [When speaking of the author of the two books *Ad Theophilum*]: " I make no apology for speaking of ' Luke ': those who prefer ' $Lk_1$', ' $Lk_2$', . . . ' $Lk_n$', are, of course, welcome to their opinion. I would only observe that in grammar and vocabulary and phraseology $Lk_1$, $Lk_2$, . . . $Lk_n$ have an astonishing resemblance to one another." So also Deissmann, another eminent specialist on the language of the New Testament, similarly speaks of " Luke " alone (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 209).

[2] See below, Note F, page 225.

[3] To sum up: " The attribution of the Third Gospel and of the *Acts* to Luke was never disputed in ancient times." (Loisy: *Les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris, 1920, Introduction, p. 17).

[4] 'Ο ναύτης Μαρκίων, *nauclerus Ponticus*. Marcion had brought with him to the community in Rome 200,000 sesterces, which were returned to him after his secession. On all these points see Chapter II of Harnack's work: *Marcion, das Evangelium des fremden Gottes*, in *TU*, XLV, 4 (3rd series, XIV, 4). Also *Neue Studien zu Marcion*, *TU*, XLIV, 4 (3rd series, XIV, 4).

Marcion does not name, so far as we know, the author of the Third Gospel, and only claims for him a doctrinal primacy, as being the least adulterated by the Judaisers of the apostolic age. But he knew that the work was from the pen of one of Paul's disciples, and universally received in the Church in a text which he discusses verse by verse, and which absolutely coincides with ours. We see by that the importance of this testimony to which Irenaeus only adds the name: "Luke, on his part, the companion of Paul, put into writing a book of the Gospel preached by him."[1]

---

[1] A. d'Alès: *Marcion*, in *RSR*, XII (1922), p. 139.

[2] With regard to the texts, this reconstruction was made, not originally, but most completely, by Harnack: *Marcion*, pp. 65–124 (text of the Pauline *corpus*), 165–221 (text of the Gospel).

The author of an analytical list of the books received in the Roman Church at a time when the prominent heretics were Marcion, Valentinus, and Basilides, and when the pontificate of Pope Pius I (about 140) could be described as "quite recent and in our time",[2] speaks in these terms of the two "Discourses" of Luke:

> The third book of the Gospel, according to Luke.
> This Luke, a physician, after the ascension of Christ,
> As Paul had, as his companion,
> Taken him with him in his own name,
> Wrote about everything which he had heard said. But neither had he
> Seen the Lord in the flesh, and that is why, so far as he could thus inform himself,
> He began to relate his history from the nativity of John. . . .
>
> . . . But the acts of all the apostles
> Have been written in a single book. Luke, for the Excellent Theophilus
> Has set down everything that passed
> Before his eyes, even as the omission of the passion of Peter
> Clearly shows, as also that of the departure of Paul
> Leaving Rome to go into Spain. . . .[3]

But it would be useless to prolong quotations which do not notably vary: they all send us back to an early disciple, who was educated, a physician, and hailed from Antioch,[1] and who was a companion of St. Paul, whose Gospel he put into writing.

---

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, III, 1, 1; see also III, 10, 1: *Lucas autem sectator et discipulus apostolorum . . .*; and III, 14, 1: *cooperarius . . . apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli*, and the whole of this chapter XIV.

[2] "*Nuperrimet temporibus nostris In urbe Roma herma conscripsit sedente cathetra urbis romae aeclesiae pio e̅p̅s̅ frater eius*": *Frag. Muratorian.*, Ed. by Th. Zahn. GK., II, p. 5, lines 74–77. The text given by E. S. Buchanan in the *JTS*, VIII, 1907, p. 540 *seq.*, does not differ on this point.

[3] *Ibid.*, lines 2–9; 34–39. I take the *iuris studiosum* of line 4 to be the equivalent of παράπομπος; and the *ex opinione* of line 6 for ἐξ or δι ἀκοῆς. See the authorities in Lagrange: *Évangile selon saint Luc*, pp. xii, xiii.

This last point must be illustrated, and at the same time confirmed, by a study of the work itself.

Written in excellent style,[2] the two "Discourses" of Luke are undoubtedly the only books of the New Testament which can be elucidated by a study of the literary forms of Hellenism. The author himself invites us to this by the exquisite prologue to his first work:

> "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a narration of the things that have been accomplished among us, according as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word: it seemed good to me also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning, to write to thee, most excellent Theophilus, in order that thou mayst know the verity of those words in which thou hast been instructed."[3]

This flawless sentence, which has justly been compared to the charm of the opening phrase of the Greek physician Dioscorides in his *De Materia Medica*, is the most authoritative and most concise statement of the author's intentions. This prologue, composed according to literary rules,[4] has given rise to a whole literature, though we cannot say that from it it has always received additional clarity.[1]

---

[1] Eusebius, *HE*, III, 4, 6.

[2] See the very discerning judgment of J. H. Moulton: *A Grammar of N.T. Greek*, II, 1, pp. 6 *seq.*: "We are left then with Luke as the only *littérateur* among the authors of N.T. books."

[3] *Lk.* i, 1–4. Ancient writers often translated: "the ministers of the Word", but this was a terminological exactness which added to the text, for, in St. Luke's language, λόγος always has the more general sense of *doctrine*. This is one of those excesses which underline and isolate a real feature which a more exact translation leaves quite vague. For the doctrine, the word, of which the first witnesses made themselves the ministers, was the Gospel in the full and primitive sense of the term, which means less the Person of Christ than his message.

[4] Pindar said: "To uphold the porch in front of the building, let us make golden columns. . . . We must give to the work which is being raised a façade which strikes the attention from afar." *Olympics*, VI, 1, ed. by A. Puech, I, 1922, p. 80.

Apart from one or two details which the position of the words does not permit us to determine for certain,[2] the general sense is plain. In his plan of writing the Gospel Luke was not the first in the field : several had attempted it before him, and that not in mere fragments, but in a connected narrative. The subject to be thus covered was the history of Christian origins (these contemporary words sound strangely, but we must keep to what they mean) and this history was to be authentic, in fact, as it had been transmitted by the only irreproachable witnesses ; those who had seen and had served Christ from the beginning, the baptism of Jesus by John.[3] Luke in no way disqualifies his predecessors ; he merely claims his right, since he had taken the trouble to institute a precise and complete inquiry into the whole subject, to draw up in his turn a connected, and clear story,[4] for the sake of " the excellent Theophilus ", that is, according to all probability, for a convert who bore this name and whose position, whether official or semi-official, justified so honourable a title.[5] In this way the neophyte would be able to realise the solidity of the catechetical instructions he had received.[1]

---

[1] A list of the most recent works of any note will be found on the first page of the monumental study by H. J. Cadbury: *Commentary on the Preface of Luke*, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, II, 1922, pp. 488–510. To this may be added the work of Lagrange, *Évangile selon saint Luc*, pp. 1–8, and the consideration of the question by F. H. Colson: *Notes on St. Luke's Preface*, in the *JTS*, XXIV, 1923, pp. 300–309, together with the author's references to his previous works. Cadbury quotes on the matter the remark of the author of the second book of Machabees: " It is a foolish thing to make a long prologue and to be short in the story itself ", *Mach.* ii, 33. Lucian, in his counsels to historians, insists later on on the same point.

[2] For example, the attribution of the adverb ἀκριβῶς, to St. Luke's inquiry (παρηκολουθηκότι), or to the narrative (σοι γράψαι).

[3] It seems that this starting-point (ἀρχή) is certainly fixed by the parallel and more explicit texts in *Acts*, e.g. i, 21 seq.: x, 36–37; and in *Mk.* i, 1. But this does not exclude the appropriateness of a " prehistory " relating the childhood of Jesus, as the example of Luke himself sufficiently shows.

[4] This is more probably the meaning of καθεξῆς ; to translate it as " by order ", or " in order ", is to exaggerate its force. See the dissertation and, above all, the examples in H. J. Cadbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 504–505.

[5] Κράτιστε Θεόφιλε (*Acts* i, 1, ὦ Θεόφιλε). This name was then much used. The epithet, generally rendered in Latin by *egregius*, was official; but it could be also given by courtesy to a person of importance though without an actual position.

St. Luke's story, thus established in the domain of history, begins with a delightful account of the childhood of Christ. In the third chapter it enters the realm of the Gospel in the strict sense. After the usual preliminaries (the Baptism and the Temptation of Jesus) the rest falls into two principal parts: the ministry in Galilee, the beginning of which the author places, with logical rather than chronological justification, at Nazareth (iv, 14 to ix, 51); and secondly the going up to Jerusalem (ix, 51 to xviii, 31). The story of the last days, the Passion and the Resurrection, form, as in all the other Gospels, the conclusion. This division of the ministry, also, is usual in the evangelists, with its point of cleavage at the confession of St. Peter and the episodes following that, all of which (including the announcement of the Passion, and the Transfiguration) fall together. But while in *Mark* the narrative progresses during the course of the second part, it really seems as though the order followed in that part by Luke (as also that adopted by Matthew) is much more an order of exposition than an order of fact. In a geographical framework that is varied and a little uncertain, it is the important pronouncements of the Master, led up to by diverse incidents, which form the real matter. And benefiting in many of the subjects of which he treats (e.g., prayer, mercy, riches and poverty) by first-hand teaching which was not made use of by his predecessors, Luke delights and triumphs in this portion. These chapters form the most beautiful part of a whole in which nothing is mediocre.

The general views which guide the narrative are so clear that there is almost complete agreement on them between exegetes of all schools. For Luke manifestly writes for Gentile readers who "fear God". He takes infinite pains on their behalf, and he tones down and explains Semitic expressions which might have otherwise shocked them.[1] So, too, he cuts down for the sake of their logical and freer habits of mind, many details of lesser interest or which are too much particularised. His narrative, limpid and readable, perfectly assimilates its sources: it makes them its own, to such an extent that it would be impossible for us to restore the text of St. Mark in the long passages in which Luke practically contents himself with transcribing them. And yet, at the same time, he thoroughly retains that freshness of impression which as a rule can only come from an actual eyewitness.[2]

---

[1] *περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.* The *ἀσφάλεια* thus placed at the end of the sentence, in a conspicuous manner, is the quality which the most objective of the old historians, Polybius, praises as the distinction of a historical narrative. See the text in Lagrange's study: *Luc historien religieux*, in *Évangile selon saint Luc*, pp. cxxix–cxxxvi; and, on the Acts, A. Wikenhauser: *Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert*, pp. 87–169.

Three preferences direct the hand of the artist[3] in his choice of and presentation of events, and give to the picture its character and its distinctive note. The first of these is the divine mercy, the εὐδοκία, that loving-kindness which is poured out by God and by its amplitude astounds us with our shabby human standards. The barriers of race are abolished; "all flesh shall see the salvation (worked by) God";[4] and these words (this future for the Gospel) which open the public ministry of Jesus, Luke places also in St. Paul's mouth, at the end of his second Discourse.[1] Admirably do they express his governing thought, which itself is also thoroughly Pauline. But there are other barriers which must also be broken down, those of caste prejudice, of selfishness, of egoism, and of hardness of heart: need we recall here the stories of the woman who was a sinner, of Zachaeus, and of the Good Thief, the parables of the Good Samaritan, of the Pharisee and the Publican, and that of the Prodigal Son?[2] It is St. Luke alone who has handed these down to us, thereby meriting the glorious title bestowed on him by Dante: *Scriba mansuetudinis Christi.*[3]

---

[1] For instance, the genealogy inserted in iii, 21–38 goes back even to God: through Adam. . . . "If you do good to them (only) who do good to you, what thanks are to you? For sinners (*Mt.* v, 47: *the heathen*) also do this", *Lk.* vi, 33. And the recommendation made to the apostles: "Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the city of the Samaritans enter ye not" (*Mt.* x, 5) is omitted in *Lk.* ix, 2.

[2] F. C. Burkitt in a study: *The Use of Mark in the Gospel according to Luke*, which is the best of a collection of articles in which all are far from being of equal value (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, II, 1922, pp. 106–120) notes very shrewdly: "The consummate art (of Luke) . . . the simplicity that is the highest art. And much of this simplicity and directness of effect comes, no doubt, from the fact that Luke is not inventing, but simply retelling, without essential change, tales that are to a large extent founded on the reminiscences of those who had heard the Master." (p. 117.)

[3] This word is not too strong, and justifies the old legends which speak of Luke as having been a painter. In truth, he is so, and, particularly in regard to the infancy of Christ, all Christian artists are his natural debtors. The oldest known record of the legend is not, as some have said, that of Nicephorus Callistus in the fourteenth century, but Theodore the Reader, of the Church of Constantinople, in the sixth century. See Plummer: *A Critical . . . Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*, pp. xxi, xxii.

[4] *Lk.* iii, 6, quoting *Is.* xl, 5, Septuagint version.

But it is not only in sinners, publicans, Samaritans, and Gentiles that Luke would have us perceive candidates for the Kingdom of God. Throughout his two works he displays a marked predilection for the poor; and by the poor he does not mean, whatever Renan may say,[4] those Ebionites who pushed love of poverty to an all-embracing hatred of riches, considering them the instrument of Satan. The poor blessed by Christ in St. Luke's Gospel have nothing of the sectarian or the madman in them: they are, as the text shows, the simple, the pure of heart, the detached, those in whom the deceitful illusion of riches has not obliterated the word of God.[5] But it is true that this last point of view is placed in singular relief by the evangelist;[1] that Luke appeals from the scandalous inhumanity of the wealthy to the judgment of God;[2] and that he emphasises with obvious pleasure the generous efforts made by the first Christians[3] to solve the question of poverty and, according to St. Paul's phrase, to bring about "an equality, as it is written: He that had much had nothing over; and he that had little had no want."[4]

---

[1] *Acts* xxviii, 28.

[2] *Lk.* vii, 36, *seq.;* xix, 3–10; xxiii, 39–43; x, 25–38; xviii, 9–15; xv, 11–32.

[3] *De Monarchia*, i, 16.

[4] *Les Évangiles*, p. 276 *seq.:* "The rich man is always guilty; hell is his certain fate. . . . Luke's doctrine is pure Ebionism". G. Papini has followed the same line with his customary heat (*Storia di Cristo*. English translation: *The Story of Christ*, Hodder and Stoughton). Nowadays all are agreed in rejecting so exaggerated a view; cf. Jülicher: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Fribourg in B., 1894, p. 206: "The Ebionite character of this Gospel (Luke's) has often been spoken of . . . and quite wrongly: its hostile attitude towards the world and its pleasures was in evidence everywhere throughout the whole post-apostolic Church. . . . There is no justification for speaking of an Ebionitic tendency in the Gospel." This is the opinion also of Plummer: *A Critical Commentary to Luke*, pp. xxv–xxvi. On the "Poor", in Israel at this time, see below pp. 262-3, and Vol. II (Bk. III, ch. II).

[5] Ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου, *Mt.* xiii, 22; *Mk.* iv, 19. Luke has simplified the passage, speaking simply of "riches" (viii, 14).

We have mentioned mercy, and love of whatever cuts off or loosens attachment to temporal goods; finally let us speak of domestic life, and especially that of Jesus and of his apostles

---

[1] For example in transcribing the Beatitudes: "Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the Kingdom of God. . . . But woe to you that are rich: for you have your consolation." (*Lk.* vi, 20, 24). Lagrange, however, justly remarks that we must bear in mind the context which refers to "the disciples of Jesus" (vi, 20), i.e. the righteous poor, the poor of God, those who place "all their trust in God", following the idea of the Psalms. *Évangile selon saint Luc*, pp. 187, *seq.*

[2] *Lk.* xvi, 19–31. In this parable, the popular instinct, which calls the rich man "the evil rich man", is correct. But St. Luke's terminology corresponds strictly to his enunciation of the first Beatitude and its corresponding malediction. Moreover the end of the parable shows us that any rich Jew of good will had, in the Law of Moses and the instructions of the Prophets (which do not impose actual poverty, but charity, alms-giving, and detachment), the means of avoiding the evil consequences of his wealth.

[3] *Acts* ii, 44–46; iv, 34–37; v, 1–12. St. Luke's views on the whole question are expressed in his enthusiastic description of a state of affairs in which through the generosity of the more comfortably provided "they gave to each one according to his needs", and in which "neither was there any one needy among them" (iv, 34).

This is what has been called "evangelical communism" by those who forget that this expression, as also "social revolution" (Loisy, *Synoptiques*, I, Ceffonds, 1907, p. 545) and "class hatred" (Kautsky) etc., suggests to us social conditions very different to those which then existed, and almost necessarily misleads the reader. H. J. Holtzmann, who treats the question with his usual learning (*Lehrbuch der Neutestamentliche Theologie*, 2nd edition, Jülicher and Bauer, Tübingen, 1911, I, pp. 525–530), also forces the note when he concludes that, for Luke, "wealth is pernicious in itself and for its own sake; poverty brings salvation in itself and for its own sake", p. 528.

Much sounder is the criticism of Troeltsch (*Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, 1912, p. 49 *seq.*, 1923, Tübingen; *Gesammelte Schriften*, I.) who says: "It was a communism which, as opposed to every other kind, should be called a religious communism, based on love (*religiöses Liebeskommunismus*). . . . All idea of equality was absent from it, whether the absolute equality of possessions, or relative equality in the redivision of profits in proportion to production; its essential quality was simply that all made some sacrifice from their goods, and that all had sufficient wherewith to live. How much each sacrificed, and how much each possessed, was a secondary matter."

[4] *II Cor.* viii, 14.

Peter and Paul, among the subjects beloved by “the most dear physician”.[1] In this connection it has been justly remarked that women occupy a more prominent place in St. Luke's two books than in the other Gospels. Thus we have in his work mention of Elizabeth, mother of John the Baptist; Anne, the venerable prophetess of the Temple; the widowed mother of the young man restored to life at Naim; the sinful woman at the house of Simon the Pharisee; the women whom Jesus had healed: “Mary who is called Magdalen, out of whom seven devils were gone forth, and Joanna, the wife of Chusa, Herod's steward, and Susanna and many others,” who accompanied and served the apostolic party, defraying the charges of its upkeep;[2] so also he mentions the only daughter of Jairus;[3] the two sisters Martha and Mary; the women of Jerusalem on the road to Calvary; the Galilean women before the cross; and the first announcers of the Resurrection, Mary the Magdalen, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James. And all these are peculiar to Luke, or at least he has made them his own by some notable detail added. Nor is the part played by women in *Acts* less considerable, ranging from Mary, the mother of John surnamed Mark, and her servant Rose,[4] to the too celebrated Bernice,[5] and including the good Tabitha of Lydda;[6] the mother of Timotheus at Lystra;[7] the generous Lydia of Philippi;[8] the noble ladies of Berea;[9] Damaris of Athens;[10] Priscilla the exile from Rome, and the hostess of Paul at Corinth;[11] the four inspired daughters of Philip the evangelist;[12] and Drusilla, the king's daughter unworthily married to the procurator Felix.[13]

But in these two books there is marked out above all these women Mary, the mother of Jesus, to whose testimony the historian certainly seems to refer when he notes insistently, in regard to events of which she was the sole, or the most authoritative, witness, that "she kept all these words, pondering them in her heart".[1]

---

[1] *Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός*, *Col.* iv, 14.

[2] *Lk.* viii, 2–4.

[3] *Lk.* viii, 42.

[4] *Acts* xii, 12, 13

[5] *Acts* xxv, 13, 23; xxvi, 30.

[6] *Acts* ix, 36 *seq.*

[7] *Acts* xvi, 1.

[8] *Acts* xvi, 14 *seq.*

[9] *Acts* xvii, 12.

[10] *Acts*, xvii, 34.

[11] *Acts*, xviii, 1–4.

[12] *Acts* xxi, 8–9.

[13] *Acts* xxiv, 24.

Now there is nothing in all these touching details which militates against the unanimous attribution of these books, by ancient Christianity, to a companion of St. Paul. There is nothing either in the manner or in the matter which is not compatible with an author who was a convert of Greek and pagan origin, possibly "fearing God" before his adhesion to Christ, certainly educated, and a physician by profession[2] (which last fact made him doubly useful to the Apostle, who was *émotif*, and never free from illness of some sort). And doubts have also been expressed in connection with St. Luke's doctrine. It is maintained that while it is Catholic and Pauline in its language, its scope, and its general tendency, the third Gospel in all else remains Judaeo-Christian.[3] If we were to suppose that this were true we might say with

---

[1] *Luke* ii, 19, 51.

[2] Does St. Luke's language bear the mark of his medical training? Examined, apparently, by the English doctor, John Freind, in his *History of Physick* in 1725, and again in 1841 by J. K. Walker, the question was decided in the affirmative in the celebrated work of W. K. Hobart: *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, Dublin, 1882. Since then it has been discussed several times, notably by Plummer in his *Critical . . . Commentary to . . . Luke*, pp. lxiii–lxvii; and by Harnack, in the first volume of his *Beitraege*, (*Lukas der Arzt*), pp. 122–138. Since then, the discussion has been resumed by H. J. Cadbury in his *Style and Literary Method of Luke* (*Harvard Theological Studies*, VI), 1919, which he summed up once more in the *Beginnings of Christianity*, II, pp. 349–355. He came to the conclusion that Harnack's arguments neither proved the point in dispute nor could possibly prove it, for "the whole assumption of 'medical language' in any ancient writer is a mare's nest:" there was no technical language at that time. (*Loc. cit.*, p. 355, note 1). But that is too sweeping a statement. If it is hazardous to attempt to argue in favour of his medical training from the fact that Luke used the correct terms in the passages in which he described maladies, it must be conceded that this trait is at least the mark of an educated man. Lagrange, after passing in review the remarks put forward by Cadbury, said: "Luke's language . . . is that of a cultivated man, peculiarly conversant with medicine." *Évangile selon saint Luc*, p. cxxvii.

[3] Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der Neutestament. Théologie*, p. 519, *seq.*: "Without any doubt the actual language of the third evangelist is partly formed on that of the Apostle" (p. 520, p. 301, *seq.*). "On the other hand, specifically Pauline dogmatism should not be looked for in the third Gospel . . . Luke's Paulinism is shown almost entirely in this Gospel's fundamental universalist tendency": *Ibid.*, pp. 520, 521.

This is also the opinion of Paul Feine (*Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Leipzig, 1919, p. 528 *seq.*): "The Gospel and Acts do not plainly bear the Pauline stamp", Harnack[1] that Luke had assimilated the essential teaching of his master, Paul, no better than Mark. But that is an under-estimation. When we speak of *Paulinism*, we must, in the systematic reconstruction of the Apostle's teaching,[2] distinguish between what is St. Paul's original contribution to the edifice and what is only original in its manner of presentation, the placing of Christian materials, common to the whole primitive Community, in a Pauline setting. We cannot expect to find in a Gospel anything but preparatory statements or stepping-stones to what St. Paul often calls "my Gospel,"[3]—those things which base it *on the message of Christ.* And this is what we actually find in St. Luke's books.

To go further, to take the Pauline developments, authoritative and inspired as they are, as the principal or sole starting-point, and to reconstruct from one of them the primitive teaching, the Gospel of Jesus, the religion of the spirit—that was the undertaking and the error of a Marcion in the second century, and of a Martin Luther in the sixteenth. They based their work, the latter on a few chapters of the *Epistle to the Romans*, the former on some verses from the *Epistle to the Galatians*, and reconstructed the whole edifice from this "Paulinism," or rather from these fragments,

---

etc. The contrary view appears in the words of Sabatier, who in his study, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, *ESR*, XI, pp. 781–897, speaking of Luke, says: "If Paul's disciples had a Gospel written, it is that one. On every page the merit of legal works is denied, and the grace of God and the faith of a repentant heart glorified", p. 789.

[1] *Lukas der Arzt*, *Beitraege*, I, pp. 113–117. Yet Harnack acknowledges that in the second part of *Acts* Luke comes much nearer the Epistles of St. Paul and "excellently completes them", p. 117.

[2] On this question, the treatise by Prat, *Théologie de saint Paul*, II, pp. 13 *seq.*, seems to me to express most happily what can be said on such a matter. A mode of thought so charged with doctrine as was that of St. Paul is not a simple store-house, but a chaos of ideas and of views which it would be impossible to unite in any single whole which would be sufficiently logical and coherent. But it must not be forgotten that this "reconstruction", well-founded though it may be, and respectful towards the apostle's line of thought, is entirely, "systematic". See, also Holtzmann, *Die Frage nach dem System*, in his *Lehrbuch der N.T. Theologie*, II pp. 8–12.

[3] Prat, *Théologie de saint Paul*, II, pp. 3–11.

without taking sufficient account of the Christian, or even the Pauline, context. Are we to say that Luke had preceded them in this course; that he had made his master's views react on his presentation of Christ's doctrine, the common patrimony of all the faithful; that he had wrecked the substance of the Gospel on the Pauline rocks?

His historic sense, his good faith, his knowledge and the very lessons of St. Paul saved him from this error; and that is a very remarkable indication of what we may call his "objectivity". When it is sought, after that, to destroy at its foundations the historic value of his second Discourse by placing in opposition to the descriptions (for various reasons episodical and interrupted) in the *Acts* the few concrete details supplied by St. Paul's Epistles, the attempt betrays more of prejudice than of sound historical method.

## 4. THE SYNOPTIC FACT AND THE PROBLEM

We might be able to leave at that point this study of our first three Gospels, and to determine, by considering their historical value, whether these writings came to us independent of each other. But we already know that this is not the case. Consequently it remains for us to set forth, as briefly as possible, what may be called "the Synoptic fact". Now this fact is distinct to some extent from "the Synoptic question". In whatever way we try to explain the genesis of these documents, the curious combination, *concordia discors*, of obvious similarities and of subtle differences which they display when compared one with another actually exists, and, once it is realised and definitely marked out, cannot fail to influence our method of using these sources. It is important, then, to realise this very real fact. The complete solution of the problem presented by it, apart from the fact that it must necessarily be largely conjectural, belongs rather to the literary history of the New Testament. But, on the other hand, a knowledge of the Synoptic fact, together with its primary conclusions touching the independence or the interdependence of the various narratives, is indispensable when writing the history of Jesus.

The first known attempts at a detailed comparison between the Gospels were undertaken with the practical aim of simplifying the liturgy. Since the Gospel itself was single, and yet there were in existence four authoritative versions of it (both of which facts were recognised by the whole Church about the middle of the second century), it seemed desirable to some to re-establish unity, even literary unity, by retaining of these four versions only what was necessary for the composition of one single narrative. This task was undertaken in the first place by the Syrian Tatian, a disciple of St. Justin at Rome; he compiled his *Gospel from the Four*[1] in the Syriac tongue in the years 172–173. If this had been everywhere adopted the Synoptic problem would never have arisen. But the "Tetramorphous" Gospel survived, and imposed itself even on the Churches of the Syriac tongue.

In the third century, an attempt of a more disinterested character was made by a certain Alexandrian named Ammonius who, under the same title of *The Diatessaron* composed a work of a very different nature. Opposite St. Matthew's text, which was written out continuously, Ammonius placed the parallel passages of the other evangelists. His work, which had been carried out "most carefully and zealously"[2] was repeated by Eusebius in a more scientific fashion. Each Gospel was divided into fragments numbered successively, and then tables were drawn up which compared the parallel fragments in the different documents. Thus were obtained " canons " which made it easy to group and to compare the passages in which four, three, or two of the evangelists report the same fact or the same words of the Saviour ; at the same time marginal indications of the canons and the fragments made the use of these tables simple. It was on an example of the Hieronymite recension provided with these marginal notes that St. Augustine worked[1] when writing his book *De Consensu Evangeliorum* (about 400), in which the great doctor examined the Synoptic fact from the doctrinal and apologetical point of view.

---

[1] *τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον*, or more briefly the *Diatessaron*. On its date, see H. J. Vogels, *Grundriss der Einleitung in das N.T.*, Münster i W., 1925, p. 40. The question of the origin of the *Diatessaron* is obscure and has given rise to much argument; opinions differ on the primitive form of this concordance and on the language in which it was first written. Lagrange (*RB*, 1920, p. 326) thinks that Tatian composed it in Greek; while Burkitt (*JTS*, XXV, 1924, p. 127 *seq.*) is of opinion that Tatian's Syriac *Diatessaron* was preceded by a Latin concordance. Whatever we may think of these hypotheses, it was under the Syriac form that the *Diatessaron* was chiefly circulated and is best known to us. Cf. Vogels, *Die altsyrischen Evangelien in ihrem Verhaltnis zu Tatians Diatessaron*, Frieburg, 1911; and Lagrange, *RB*, 1920, p. 324 *seq.*

[2] These are the expressions used by Eusebius in his letter to Carpianus, which alone preserves for us the memory and even the name of Ammonius.

Very much later, and not till towards the end of the eighteenth century, German critics and evangelical theologians—Lessing and Herder, Griesbach and Eichhorn, and a little later Schleiermacher—brought the question on to the literary level, applying to it the philological methods then in vogue. Since then, works on the subject have multiplied ; one could make a library of them, in which many shelves would furnish instructive contributions to the history of the aberrations of the human mind. None the less he would greatly deceive himself who saw in this immense effort nothing but a failure on the part of the higher criticism.

In truth, when we study in a careful synopsis[2] those portions of the Gospel story which are common to all three we realise that, from the ministry of John the Baptist to the end, the three narratives contain a large amount of identical material. Dealing as they do with the same history, that is natural enough, but what is less so is that a very great number of the events in that history, which are at once fragmentary and, in some parts, very detailed, follow each other and are connected in the same manner in all three Gospels.[1] And these sequences are the more striking in that, as we have seen, the evangelists are by no means particular in the matter of chronology.[2] We might compare all these cases to a whole arcade, with its columns and sculptured capitals, moved *en bloc* in amongst other monuments quite differently set and ordered.

---

[1] Zahn, *Einleitung*, English edition, II, p. 422.

[2] Larfeld: *Grieschische Synopse der vier N.T. Evangelien*, etc. Tübingen, 1911; Burton and Goodspeed: *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek*, Chicago, 1920; Camerlynck: *Synopsis* (Latin), Bruges, 1921. It has not been possible to use the excellent *Synopsis Evangelica Graeca* of Lagrange and Lavergne, Barcelona and Paris, 1926, except during the revision of this book. [In English, Robinson: *A Harmony of the Four Gospels*, London, c. 1860; Barton, *A Catholic Harmony of the Four Gospels, London*, 1930. Tr.]

[1] Here are some of these characteristic sequences: the healing of a paralytic; the calling of Levi (Matthew); the question of fasting: *Mt.* ix, 1–17; *Mk.* ii, 1–22; *Lk.* v, 17–39. Three detailed accounts of miracles: the calming of the storm; the demoniac of the Gerasens; the raising to life of the daughter of Jairus: *Mt..* viii 18, ix, 34; *Mk.* iv, 35, v, 43; *Lk.* viii, 22–56. St. Peter's confession; Jesus foretelling his Passion; the transfiguration; the cure of a young epileptic; and the second prophecy of the Passion; *Mt.* xvi, 13, xvii, 23; *Mk.* viii, 27, ix, 32; *Lk.* ix, 18–45. Then there are also four questions or cases of conscience, followed by a general address by the Master: the tribute payable to Cæsar; questions concerning the Resurrection; others on the greatest commandment; and yet other questions on the Son of David: *Mt.* xxii, 15, xxiii, 12; *Mk.* xii, 13–40; *Lk.* xx, 20–47. Finally we may mention five developments of the discourse on the Last Things: the destruction of the Temple; the great tribulation; the abomination of desolation; the coming of the Son of Man; the time of the Judgment: *Mt.* xxiv, 1–44; *Mk.* xiii, 1–37; *Lk.* xxi, 5–33.

[2] Except as regards the main outlines, the important features, which are not numerous. They are: (i) The events forming "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus" (*Mk.* i, 1), i.e. the testimony of the Baptist and the citing of the prophecies; the Baptism of Jesus and the testimony of the Father; the Temptation; (ii) Peter's confession and the events which followed it: the change in the goal, the end being henceforth Jerusalem where the Passion must take place; and the Transfiguration; (iii) the last days at Jerusalem up to the triumphal entry; (iv) the Passion and the Resurrection. Apart from these few landmarks, the chronology of the First and Third Gospels is very largely subordinated to their doctrinal and apologetical ends, although we might establish in each of them sequences of events which are probably based (as regards their order) on a historical tradition. That such was the case as regards St. Matthew was the opinion of Maldonatus, as we have already said above. It was also that of Cornelius a Lapide, whom Thaddeus Soiron very appositely quotes in this connection (*Die Logia Jesu*, Münster i. W, 1916, pp. v–vi): "*Evangelistarum scopus et propositum fuit*", writes this judicious Flemish Jesuit, "*non omnia dicta factaque Christi enarrare, sed pauca e multis, praecipua e communibus seligere, ut per ea doctrinam et vitae Christi imaginem et quasi ideam nobis proponerent. . . . Hac de causa saepe non servant ordinem temporis in recensendis Christi dictis et factis ; multa etiam silet unus quae alii exprimunt, et tamen sic suam continuat et prosequitur narrationem, quasi nihil sit omissum. . . . Disparatas non raro jungunt sententias, parabolas, sermones, quae nullum inter se habent nexum vel ordinem, sed alio tempore, alia occasione et de alia materia dictae sunt a Christo*", *Commentaria in IV Evangelia*. It will be shown later on why we consider that a rather less vague chronological order must be recognised in the Second Gospel. If K. L. Schmidt (*Die Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, Berlin, 1919) has exaggerated in placing in such prominence the absence of chronological sequence in the Gospels, Levesque (*Nos Quatre Evangiles*, Paris, 1923), on his part, has, we think, gone too far in the opposite sense.

The resemblance in style is even more marked ; very often it is a case of whole passages literally reproduced, or inserted with but the slightest retouching by writers whose manner and literary culture, as well as the readers and the end aimed at, are, as we have seen already, very different in each case. Nor is this plainly identical text, which sometimes persists throughout a whole episode, only to be found in the words of Jesus. We could easily understand how his exact words would have been scrupulously respected. But it exists also in the narrative, in transitions, and in details of style which are not, of themselves, of any marked value. It is impossible to make this plain without giving an example.[1]

| *Matt.* xii, 1-4 | *Mark* ii, 23-26 | *Luke* vi, 1-4 |
|---|---|---|
| At that time | And it came to pass | And it came to pass |
| Jesus went | that he walked | that on a sabbath |
| on the sabbaths | on the sabbaths | he was walking |
| through the cornfields | through the cornfields | through the cornfields, |
| and his disciples were hungry | and his disciples began | and his disciples plucked |
| and began to pluck | to walk plucking | and ate the ears, rubbing them in their hands. |
| the ears and to eat. | the ears. | |
| But the Pharisees seeing this | And the Pharisees | And some of the Pharisees |
| said to him | said to him: | said: |
| Behold, thy disciples do | Behold, why do they | Why do you |
| what it is not lawful | what is not lawful | what is not lawful |
| to do on the sabbath. | on the sabbaths? | on the sabbaths? |
| But he said to them: | And he said to them: | And answering them Jesus said: |
| Have you not read | Did you never read | Have you not even read the thing |
| what David did | what David did, when he had need | that David did |

---

[1] I naturally translate here with the utmost literalness, rendering every Greek word by the same French word and leaving the τοῖς σάββασιν in the plural despite the real meaning. [In the English the same course has been followed, the French being compared with the Greek original.—Tr.] The text is that of Burton and Goodspeed, and therefore substantially that of Westcott and Hort.

| *Matt.* xii, 1-4 | *Mark* ii, 23-26 | *Luke* vi, 1-4 |
|---|---|---|
| when he was hungry | and was hungry | when he was hungry, he |
| and those who were with him? | and those who were with him? | and those who were with him? |
| How he entered | How he entered | How he entered |
| into the house of God | into the house of God, under Abiathar the high priest | into the house of God, |
| and they ate the loaves | and ate the loaves | and taking the loaves |
| of proposition, | of proposition, | of proposition ate and gave to those with him, |
| which it was not lawful for him to eat, nor for those who were with him | which it is not lawful to eat | which it is not lawful to eat |
| but for the priests alone? | but for the priests, | but for the priests only? |
| | and gave also to those who were with him? | |

And like similarities of expressions, somewhat set off by imperceptible differences in style or vocabulary, are to be found in twenty, in a hundred passages, sometimes much longer.[1] And if we pass from the threefold narrative to that which is common to two of the Synoptists, *Matthew* and *Mark* or (though more rarely) *Matthew* and *Luke*, we often come across passages that are almost absolutely identical. Here is an example, one amongst very many, in which the differences of words accentuates both the fundamental similarity of the two and the style peculiar to *Mark*:

---

[1] See, for example, the first testimony of John the Baptist, *Mt.* iii, 11, and its parallels; the healing of Simon Peter's mother-in-law and what followed, *Mt.* viii, 14–16 and its parallels; the healing of the paralytic, *Mt.* ix, 1–8 and its parallels; the banquet offered to the Master by Levi (Matthew) *Mt.* ix, 9–13 and its parallels; the man with the withered hand and his cure, *Mt.* xii, 9–14 and parallel passages; the whole story of the demoniac of Gerasa, *Mt.* viii, 28–34 and the parallel passages; the whole story of the raising to life of Jairus's daughter, and, entangled with it, the incident of the woman with the issue of blood, *Mt.* xi, 18–34 and the parallel passages, etc.

| *Matt.* xiv, 6-12 | *Mark* vi, 21-28 |
|---|---|
| On the anniversary of the birth of Herod | For the anniversary of his birth, Herod |
| | gave a feast to his great men, to the tribunes |
| | and to the leaders of Galilee, |
| the daughter of Herodias | and the daughter of Herodias herself, having come in and |
| danced in their midst and pleased Herod | having danced, pleased Herod and those feasting with him. |
| | The king said to the young girl: “Ask what thou wilt, and I will give it to thee”, |
| who promised her with an oath to give her | and he swore to her: “Whatsoever thing thou askest of me, |
| all that she should ask of him. | I will give it to thee, though it were the half of my kingdom.” |
| But she, urged to it by her mother: | And having gone out, she said to her mother: “What should I ask?” |
| | She said to her: “The head of John the Baptist”. |
| | And having entered in again, in haste |
| | to the king, she asked him: |
| “Give me,” said she, “here, on a plate, | “I wish that forthwith thou give me, on a plate, |
| the head of John the Baptist.” | the head of John the Baptist.” |
| And, stricken sad, the king | And, having become sad, the king |
| by reason of his oaths and those feasting with him | by reason of his oaths and of the guests |
| ordered it to be given, | did not wish to disappoint the young girl; |
| and sending, | and at once, the king, having sent a guard, |
| | ordered the head (of John) to be brought. |
| he beheaded John in the prison | And going, he beheaded him in the prison |
| and his head was brought on a plate | and he brought his head on a plate |
| and was given to the young girl | and gave it to the young girl |
| and she brought it to her mother. | and the young girl gave it to her mother. |

Yet these resemblances, important and characteristic as they may be, are less disconcerting than the differences which they present, so to speak, on the reverse side. In their foundation, in their result, and in their style, these differences are not only considerable and numerous, but sometimes seem to be subject to contradictory laws. It is only with the greatest difficulty (and not without having recourse to some critical *coups de force*) that we can eventually classify them in homogeneous series.

As regards the matter treated of, it is clear at the start that two out of the three Gospels give us, before entering on the main ground, a history of the childhood of Jesus, and of such a kind that, if we only possessed one of them, it would be impossible for us to imagine the other. And even in the body of the Gospel we meet insertions and omissions equally unforeseen. Thus St. Luke, in a Gospel intended for the Gentiles, omits a very long passage in one of his essential sources[1] (*Mk.* vi, 45 to viii, 9) which is also found in *Matthew*, and closes Christ's expedition into pagan territory with the incident of the Chananite woman, so touching for his readers, which he can rewrite in his own fashion. Moreover, he does not include, despite a very similar context, some of the most characteristic words of the Master in favour of the Gentiles, words which *Matthew* and *Mark*, or *Matthew* alone (written for the Jews !), have preserved for us.[2] On the other hand, out of twenty stories of miracles, he has six which are peculiar to him, and out of twenty-three parables, he alone mentions eighteen.[3]

---

[1] See below, pp. 111–112.

[2] " Therefore I say to you that the kingdom of God shall be taken from you [Jews] and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof." (*Mt.* xxi, 43; cf. *Lk.* xx, 17). " And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations " (*Mt.* xxiv, 14). " And unto all nations the gospel must first be preached ", (*Mk.* xiii, 10; cf. *Lk.* xxi, 19).

[3] See the tables drawn up by Plummer: *A Critical . . . Commentary . . . to . . . Luke*, p. lxi. If we distinguish the " Similitudes " and the " Exemplary Stories " from the " Parables ", as does Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, Tübingen, 1910, II, pp. vii, viii), we number fourteen fragments proper to St. Luke, out of fifty-three. B. H. Streeter (*The Four Gospels*,) discovers and names sixteen.

There is, in fact, in these numerical evaluations an arbitrary element which it is impossible to eliminate. For instance, must we reckon as two the twin similitudes of the improvident builder and the improvident king (*Lk.* xiv, 28–33) ? Plummer and Streeter do so, but not Jülicher.

And the order and sequence of the discourses and the episodes offer differences just as marked. The preaching at Nazareth, which is put back by the others to a very late period,[1] is placed by St. Luke at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, before the calling, not only of the Twelve, but even of the Four. And, of the Sermon on the Mount as given by *Matthew*, he retains a discourse of less than thirty verses, and distributes a large part of the remainder over nearly a dozen different contexts.[2] Similarly the sequence of events in the first two evangelists give rise to variations which are no less paradoxical.[3]

If we take St. Mark's version, which is certainly in most respects the most natural, as the standard, we see that *Matthew*, which agrees with *Mark* as regards the sequence of events in several considerable sections (*Mt.* xiv-xviii, *Mk.* vi-ix; *Mt.* xix-xx, 34, *Mk.* x; *Mt.* xxvi-xxvii, *Mk.* xiv-xv)—despite a few omissions and more numerous additions—yet frequently and profoundly alters this order in other sections (for example: compare *Mt.* iii to xiv with *Mk.* iii to vi, 14.[4])

As regards style, a careful study of the thousands of details on which comparison can be brought to bear, if it complicates the problem and makes a summary exposition almost impossible, none the less undeniably leads to results which are on the whole tolerably certain. In point of fact, in a great number of cases (let us say, in the great majority of cases) we can, with strong probability, give the reasons for modifications which appear at first to be subject to no law. What has been said above concerning the object, the people for whom their work was intended, and the literary culture of the evangelists, very often explains the peculiarities of style, of vocabulary and of syntax. Very often, but not always; far from it! As it happens, it is the text that is considered to be the simplest, and the least "written-up" or polished, which seems to be, in comparison with the others, retouched,[1] and less spontaneous.

---

[1] *Lk.* iv, 16–30; *Mt.* xiii, 53–58; *Mk.* xvi, 1–6.

[2] See *Lk.* vii, 20–49 and vi, 31; xi, 2–4, 9–13, 33–35; xii, 21–34, 58–59; xiii, 24–27; xiv, 34–35; xvi, 13, 17–18.

[3] See the Introduction to *L'Évangile selon saint Matthieu* by Lagrange, pp. xliii–xlix; and the very consciencious analyses by V. H. Stanton: *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Cambridge, 1909, II, Table I; or that of Burton and Goodspeed: *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek*, pp. ix–xxii.

[4] Thus, the whole series of miracles on the shores of the lake—the calming of the storm, the demoniac of Gerasa, the raising to life of Jairus's daughter, which in *Mark* (iv, 35 to v, 43) are placed *after* the great discourse on the expulsion of demons in the name of Beelzebub, the arrival of Jesus's relatives, the development at the end of the parables and the enunciation of principles (*Mk.* iii, 19 to iv, 34)—are, in St. Matthew's Gospel, placed *before all these events* (the miracles in *Mt.* viii, 18 to ix, 34, and the episodes *Mk* xii, 22 to xiii, 53). Similarly, the sending forth of the apostles and the master's instructions on this occasion, which in *Mark* appear *after the fruitless preaching of Jesus in Nazareth* (the preaching in Nazareth, *Mk.* vi, 1–6; the sending forth of the apostles, *Mk.* vi, 6–11), are placed by *Matthew before* this (Nazareth, *Mt.* xiii. 54–58; the sending of the apostles, *Mt.* ix, 35 to x, 42). "Mark and Matthew each followed the order which was most convenient to himself. The facts suggest the independence of both parties, rather than their dependence": Lagrange, *loc. laud.*, p. xlvi.

How, then, are we to explain the Synoptic fact thus defined by the similarities and the divergencies which affect the foundations, the sequence and the style of the first three Gospels? The simplest solution is to say that Matthew, Mark and Luke used, each in his own way and independently of the others, oral sources which were fixed and, so to speak, stereotyped by tradition. Following many other writers, and especially the extremely learned Arthur Wright,[2] though with fresh arguments, Fr. Thaddeus Soiron[1] has brilliantly maintained this thesis, at least in what concerns the words of Jesus. For my part, I believe that it contains much truth. The method employed in evolving it does more justice to history and to the probabilities of the case than does the almost exclusively literary analysis performed, so to speak, *in vitro*, by the majority of recent critics. But, in addition to the fact that it is more difficult to apply it to the transmission of facts than to that of the words of the Saviour, it does not fail, even in regard to the latter, to present difficulties.[2]

---

[1] This is a fact recognised by the most consciencious specialists, such as Sir John Hawkins and the authors (amongst whom he figures prominently) of the valuable *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* published in 1911 by the Members of the University of Oxford, and edited by W. Sanday, Oxford, 1911. The editor justly remarks that "there is a great preponderance of data pointing towards the conclusion just stated (the literary priority of the Second Gospel); but, after all, it is a *preponderance* of evidence and not a compact mass of details pointing all the same way. There still remains a residuum of cases in which the usual relation of the documents to each other is not sustained." W. Sanday, *loc. laud.*, p. 9.

[2] In the Introduction of his *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, London, 1903. [This theory has very recently been urged most ingeniously by the Abbé Marcel Jousse in his book *Le Style Oral* in which he points out that the "oral style" existed in all languages previous to the art of writing, and that it evolved in a form which aids the memory. He instances the "law of parallelism" in Hebrew poetry, and seeks to show that the Gospel story was similarly recited by memory before being committed to writing, and points to the many "rhythms" in our Lord's words to support this thesis. His book has, however, been severely criticised by the Rt. Rev. Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., the learned Abbot of Downside (see *The Dublin Review*, July 1929, pp. 12–25), who points out that this was originally, and essentially remains, a Protestant idea. "The possibility of it, its intrinsic credibility, its persuasiveness, rest upon the assumption that early Christian

Diametrically opposed to this conception is the theory known as that of the *Two Sources*,[3] which is still dominant to-day, although here and there somewhat battered.[4] By reason of its beautiful simplicity (which, however, does not

---

catechetical instruction consisted in learning the life of Christ by heart. . . . But what happened before the New Testament was written? This was always a crux for a logical Protestant. The ' oral hypothesis ' of the origin of the Gospels supplied a simple answer. . . . Thus even before the Bible was complete the Christian religion consisted of ' the Bible, and the Bible only ', and the catechizing of converts in Apostolic times was just like any Nonconformist Sunday School." And Abbot Chapman proceeds to point out the objections to the theory from a Catholic point of view (see below).—Tr.]

[1] " Thus it has certainly been proved that the oral tradition of the *Logia* of Jesus existed down to the eve of the composition of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and immediately supplied them with the materials for their written work "; *Die Logia Jesu*, conclusion, p. 168. In his Introduction Soiron quotes as one of those who opened up this line for him (after the now out-of-date Gieseler, 1818) Paul Fiebig, especially in his work *Die Mündliche Ueberlieferung als Quelle der Synoptik*, in the *Neutest. Studien G. Heinrici . . . dargebracht*, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 79 *seq.*

[2] [" Protestant and 'liberal' critics have long since renounced a hypothesis which did not really account for the phenomena. But the *a priori* objections seem to a Catholic inquirer no less fatal. There is, in fact, neither any tradition nor intrinsic probability that Gentile Christians ever learned by heart a Greek life of Christ. . . . It is conceivable that the Jewish converts to Christianity were taught after this fashion. But it does not seem that any such considerations could assist the solution of the Synoptic problem, which is mainly a problem of explaining identity in Greek words and phrases. . . . A large amount of Our Lord's teaching, especially in St. Matthew and St. John, is ' rhythmical ' . . . (and) it is quite possible that some early Judaistic Christians learned parts of these divine discourses by heart. But Aramaic-speaking Christianity disappeared at a very early date. There is no evidence that St. Matthew (or the imaginary author of ' Q ') was a ' reciter ' or a teacher of ' recitations '." Chapman, *op. cit.*—Tr.]

[3] *Zweiquellentheorie.*

[4] [Streeter's hypothesis demands *four* documentary sources.—Tr.]

exclude certain very appreciable *nuances*) this hypothesis may be said to have received the support of the greater number of the liberal critics of our time, as well as of an appreciable number of others. In brief, it distinguishes two documents as the basis of the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke. One of these is a primarily historical narrative, very similar to, if not identical with, our actual *Mark*. The other (denoted by the sign Q, the initial letter of the German word meaning source: *Quelle*), was a collection of the sayings of Christ[1] together with a few details of facts, and was perhaps drawn up in Aramaic and (why not?) by the apostle Matthew. The essential features of Q (no doubt in somewhat differing versions) certainly reached the authors of the First and Third Gospels, and perhaps also the writer of the Second. But these two principal documents do not exclude the existence of other sources of lesser importance for *Matthew*, still less for *Luke*, which critics strive to discover.

The cardinal feature in this hypothesis (which many authors no longer take the trouble of discussing in its important points, but only examine in its secondary aspects,[2]) consists in the priority of the Gospel according to St. Mark and the identification of the principal source common to the authors of *Matthew* and *Luke* with a collection containing almost exclusively the words of Christ. It is only in regard to this collection that there can be any question in the case of St. Matthew.[3]

---

[1] Many critics, adopting an idea of Schleiermacher's (*Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien*, 1832), understand of this collection of sayings what Papias says concerning the character and the language of the First Gospel (See above, p. 57). And in the *Introduction aux Evangiles Synoptiques* by Maurice Goguel, in the *Bible du Centenaire*, published by the French Protestants, Paris, 1918, IV, pp. 16, 17, this opinion is adopted as indisputable.

[2] Such as the relations of the first source with our actual *Mark*, and whether there is ground for assuming a *pre-Mark* (*Urmarkus*), or, at least, an edition sensibly different to ours; the extent and origin of the source peculiar to *Luke*, ix, 51 to xix, 28; the extent, nature, and literary form of Q; the source for the narratives of the Infancy, etc.

[3] There is therefore no ground for associating with the holders of the theory of the Two Sources those Catholic exegetes, who, like Mangenot, Lagrange, Batiffol, Camerlynck, Tillmann, Sickenberger, and many others, distinguish two aspects in the first of these theses concerning the priority of *Mark*, and substantially identify the First Gospel in its actual form as the work of St. Matthew.

Between these opinions, which may be called extreme (amongst those which have obtained the support of really competent men), there stretches a multitude of views which it would require a volume merely to enumerate. We have only recalled these in order to place in its critical and historical surroundings the inquiry which we are making into the sources for the synoptic narratives.

From the very beginning the whole object of the primitive Christian community was to know, to put into practice, and to spread abroad the Gospel of Jesus. Now this Gospel had as its subject and its essential standard the acts and the words of the Lord,[1] and on this depended the solution of all the questions raised by the expansion and even the existence of the small original body. In all the stages of its autonomous development, at first on the borders of official Judaism, and then in opposition to it, whether it was a question of internal or external problems, recourse was always had to the teachings or the example of Christ in the last resort. Even the very gifts of the Spirit, that conquering joy, that sudden power which took possession of the faithful and gave them superhuman confidence,[2] which supported their preaching with signs and marvels,[3] which put an end to their hesitations and doubts,[4] even that, far from taking the place of the historical Christ, attended on him. The Holy Spirit is the witness to Jesus,[5] his lieutenant, the infallible reminder of his lessons,[6] and the second advocate[7] who pleads in the same cause. He depends upon him, refers himself to him entirely, and finds in the confession of the transcendence of the Lord the norm which makes it possible to distinguish his authentic inspiration from delusions.[1] It is a constant, and, from the merely historical point of view, a very remarkable, fact that the use of the gifts of the Spirit, everywhere admitted and sometimes preponderant, so far from supplanting or obscuring the personal mediation of Jesus, constantly tended to extol and to glorify it.

---

[1] *Τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα.* The Ancient in Papias, quoted by Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 14.

[2] *Mk.* xiii, 11 and parallel passages.

[3] *Acts*, iv, 31, *seq.*

[4] Concerning, for instance, the admission of Gentiles into the Church, *Acts* x, 44–47, *Coll.* xi, 15, *seq.*

[5] *᾿Εκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ*, *Jn.* xv, 26.

[6] *Jn.* xiv, 26.

[7] *῎Αλλος παράκλητος*, *Jn.* xiv, 16. On all these texts, see *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, by H. B. Swete, London, 1909. On the *second advocate* "not the Christ, but the Chrism; not the Son, but the Spirit of the Son", pp. 300, 372, 373 of the 1919 edition.

In these circumstances, the possession of his teachings, in which no distinction[2] was made as regards authority or instructional value, was a primordial necessity. A disciple did not delay manifestation of his faith until he should be compelled to confess it or to propagate it. It was for him in the first place to elucidate it, and to reconcile it with the exigencies of the Jewish conscience, which at the beginning were very pressing. Later on, it was a question of nourishing what was from the beginning not mere adhesion to a philosophical doctrine, but the unconditional gift of self to an adorable Person.

Then came the necessity of appealing to authoritative[3] witnesses, and the apostles, together with those who were shown to us from the morrow of the Ascension grouped around them,[4] were insensibly led to draw up in more or less lengthy and coherent sequence, with the purposes of edification, instruction, and apology, the doctrines which were the whole subject of their message. Their Master had moreover prepared the way for this work. His doctrine, very different to the teaching of the scribes in its authoritative tone and the freshness and novelty that pervaded it, flowed, as regards verbal forms and rhythms, in the traditional moulds of Jewish Wisdom. It is probable that, even from the lifetime of Jesus, a large number of his words circulated among his disciples with an influence that was never to be lost.

---

[1] So that none may be ignorant of it; " Wherefore I give you to understand that no man, speaking by the Spirit of God, saith Anathema to Jesus. And no man can say The Lord Jesus, but by the Holy Ghost ", *I Cor.* xii, 3 (on ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, see A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 4th Ed., p. 74 and notes). The same doctrine is to be found in *I Jn.* iv, 2–3: " Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God. And this is Antichrist," etc.

[2] *Ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν*, *Acts* i, 1. Cf. : " Beginning at this scripture [*Is.* liii, 7–8], (Philip) *preached unto him* [literally, announced to him the good tidings of] *Jesus* " ; *εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν*; *Acts* viii, 35.

[3] *Μάρτυσιν τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*; *Acts* x, 41.

[4] *Acts* i, 14.

In any case, under the pressing necessities of catechesis and apologetics, certain summaries of his teachings were very quickly formed. The oldest specimens which we possess, fragments of the teaching given to Paul of Tarsus when, two or three years after the Passion of Christ, he received what he was charged to transmit to the Corinthians twenty years later, bear on the facts of the life of the Master : the institution of the Eucharist and the list of the witnesses of the Resurrection. Other collections contained chiefly his words : the teaching gathered by Matthew in his five discourses give examples, the actual ordering of which is not always primitive. None the less, parts of them go back to an earlier period.

Soon, under the preponderating influence of the Twelve, and especially of Peter, whom all the documents show us as the head of the earliest community,[1] these summaries became organized in a definite order. If it were possible to trace the development of the matter of the Gospel after the fashion of geological charts, in which the various strata successively appear, we should see first, along with the privileged sequence of the Passion, the early events—the testimony of John the Baptist, the baptism of Jesus, the temptation ; then certain declarations on the Law as contrasted with the Gospel ; and lastly Peter's confession, surrounded by the events that preceded and followed it. Our three Synoptic versions manifestly bear this mark. But there is little doubt that side by side with this harmony we should also discover events and words that only one or two of the evangelists, or merely John alone, have transmitted to us, or perhaps none of the four.

---

[1] " We know through Paul, and through feeble echoes preserved in *Acts*, how great had been the importance of Peter in the formation and the preservation of the earliest community. It has always seemed to me that this extraordinary importance attributed to Peter was not (fully) expressed in the Synoptic tradition, which is however the primary source for our knowledge of the most ancient community ": R. Bultmann, *Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu*, etc., *ZNTW*, 1920, p. 171.

But, far from being astonished by the divergencies and the gaps in the canonical narratives, we should rather marvel at their agreement on essential points and their literal similarity on many others. And this relative unity, here and there attaining to uniformity, would undoubtedly be much greater if we had preserved the primitive summaries in the tongue in which they were first conceived and (so to speak) orally built up.[1] We know that there are none such. Jesus spoke the language of the Palestinian Israelites of his time, and it was in this same Aramaic tongue that his disciples of the mother-church of Jerusalem first taught and disputed.[2] But account had to be taken of the needs of those amongst the Gentiles who could not, or could not easily, speak anything but Greek—and these, amongst the Gentiles, and even amongst the Jews outside the Holy Land, were a tolerably large body. Hence there came into existence an adaptation the difficulty of which should not be exaggerated (for the Dispersion itself had already, especially in the Septuagint version, which was its Bible, effected a transition and given an example of such translation), but which was none the less laborious. And it was the more difficult in that those who carried out this work on the Gospel were not, with the exception of St. Luke, the possessors of wide culture. The words of the Ancient, quoted by Papias, naïvely express one aspect of the truth: "Matthew drew up the oracles (of the Lord) in the Hebrew tongue and each one interpreted them as he could".[1]

---

[1] See the studies by Primo Vannutelli, in the *RB*, 1925, pp. 32–53; 505–523.

[2] On the question of the tongue spoken by Jesus, there is in the enormous *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (by A. T. Robertson, New York, 1919, p. 26 *seq.*) a review of the various opinions. That which holds that Christ may have spoken in Greek is not altogether ruled out, for such a scholar as J. H. Moulton defends it: " That Jesus himself and the Apostles regularly use Aramaic is beyond question, but that Greek was also at command is almost equally certain." (*A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, *Prolegomena*, p. 8). All scholars are agreed at least on the first part of this pronouncement. The common opinion is given by A. Deissmann: *Licht vom Osten*, 1923, pp. 49–50, and by W. C. Allen: *The Aramaic Background of the Gospels*, in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Oxford, 1911, pp. 287–315. The question was taken up again and better treated by G. Dalman in his *Die Drei Sprachen Jesu*, which appeared in *Jesus-Jeschua*, Leipzig, 1922, pp. 1–35. He concludes that Jesus understood and to some extent spoke Greek, like every Galilean (in which he opposes Schulthess: *Das Problem der Sprache Jesu*, 1917, p. 27); it is with very good reason that we think of the examination of Jesus by Pilate, and the Master's replies (*Jn.* xviii) as taking place without the aid of an interpreter.

On the other hand it is certain that the language then spoken in Palestine and the only one generally understood by the people was Aramaic. It is impossible to doubt that this was the principal language spoken by Jesus: " Jesus was, in an even stronger sense of the word (than Paul) *Hebrew*, *the son of Hebrews*. The Aramaic of Judea was and remains the proper tongue of his speech and his thought ", p. 15.

Finally, it is certain that, through the Bible, Jesus, like all the religious men of his country and his time, knew classical Hebrew (pp. 25–34). " The fact that Jesus filled the office of reader of the prophetic passage in the Synagogue in his native town (*Lk.* iv. 16), implies that he was sufficiently versed in Hebrew. To the two tongues which Jesus used in practice, his maternal Aramaic and the official language of the government and of the immigrant Palestinians, must be added as a third language that of the Bible ", p. 35.

These circumstances explain how a written Greek edition could be largely used and could leave its literary imprint on the translation of an Aramaic work which was earlier than this edition and, fundamentally, independent of it.

But a written edition of the traditional Gospel was the slower in establishing itself by reason of the fact that the oral teaching, Aramaic or already hellenized, was more fixed and better assimilated. In this matter our modern Western habits of thought lead us almost automatically into error, and we have positively to react against them if we are to enter into what was certainly the attitude of a great part of Eastern antiquity. The first Christians, faithful to the genius of their race and the customs of their time, found their true medium in oral tradition and modulated and rhythmic recitation, in which the very accent of the Master could survive, and which needed neither the costly materials necessary for writing nor an embodiment as cumbrous as it was perishable—in short in "the living and enduring word".[2]

---

[1] Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 16. On the general sense of the phrase see above, p. 59, n. 2.

[2] "For of a surety I did not consider it possible to derive from books anything comparable in value to that of the living and enduring word, *παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης*": Papias, in Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 4.

However, this state of affairs could not last for long. The trained evangelists were few and quite insufficient for the needs of the churches; it was natural to desire to preserve, to fix in writing, the essentials of their teaching.[1] A list of the testimonies rendered to Christ by the prophets of the Old Testament constituted the first apologetic weapon in times when Christian propaganda sought its adherents above all in and around the synagogues.[2] A collection of the words and examples of the Saviour were of infinite value for the moral and religious life of the faithful;[3] but the greater number of men, outside the little Palestinian world, had neither the leisure nor even the notion of undergoing the mnemotechnical training which would transform a scribe, converted and well-informed about Christ, into a living gospel. Moreover liturgical necessities were leading to the same conclusion: side by side with the books of the Old Testament, familiar in all the churches, there came other readings, in which Christians might find the conditions of the "new covenant in the blood of Christ".[4]

All these considerations, and no doubt others as well, led to the adoption of the idea of putting in writing the Gospel message, at least in its principal parts. It is by no means certain that the first attempts in this direction contained the whole history of Jesus, even from the Baptism by John; on the contrary, it is very probable that there were first put in writing certain doctrinal and historical passages, such as the

---

[1] The most ancient writings (quoted above, pp. 68–70) attribute to this desire St. Mark's written account of Peter's teaching at Rome.

[2] We have, incorporated in the First Gospel, a whole series of texts which form an outline of the prophetic account of Christ. It is an open question whether there existed a collection of this kind independent of, and earlier than, the Gospel. An affirmative reply is favoured by V. H. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, II, p. 344). Mr. Rendel Harris developed the hypothesis in a very adventurous manner in *Testimonies* (Cambridge, I, 1916; II, 1920). The existence of a series of texts applicable to Christ is at least plausible; and it would sufficiently well explain the heterogeneous character of the text of the quotations from the Old Testament given in *Matthew*.

[3] Weiss has well shown how the ideal of the Christian life in the primitive community was modelled on the teachings of the Saviour: *Das Leben nach den Worten des Herrn*, in *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 56–60.

[4] *I Cor.* xi, 25. It is by their use in the liturgical services that St. Justin (*I Apol.* xvi) introduces his mention of the written Gospels.

Baptist's testimony, the first parables of the Kingdom of God, the Gospel teaching contrasted with the then current interpretation of the ancient Law ; the group formed by the confession of Peter, the prophecy of the Passion and the Transfiguration ; the great pronouncements of the last days, including the discourse on the end of the world and the parable of the wicked husbandmen ; and the narrative of the Passion. In fact the Synoptic Gospels all present (even the second in its latter half) characteristics which are best explained by the theory that they were compiled with the help of written documents.

Oral transmission, with the mistakes which it involves, doubtless goes far to explain the general similarity of the different Gospels, as well as certain disconcerting differences of detail which the partisans of the purely literary theory can only overcome by prodigies of ingenuity. But other aspects of the Synoptic fact call for an explanation of the literary order. Of these it would seem that one of the most striking (although it has hardly been stressed hitherto) is the difference of treatment accorded to the great twin subjects, the Passion and the Resurrection, in the first three Gospels. Although in *Luke* the story of the Passion is derived in many important details from a special source, yet it is a fact that in their main lines the three Synoptists agree. So too, the teaching of the three evangelists is specially rich and consecutive, leaving little to be desired by the curiosity of the reader. But with the Resurrection it is otherwise. Not only does it greatly vary among those of our authors where it is least incomplete,[1] but it is with all of them summary and full of omissions.

The few lines of the primitive catechesis on the same subject preserved for us by St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, add to what we know of this subject through the Synoptists.[2] Yet no one can doubt that the Gospel of the Resurrection was considered by all, from the very earliest times, to be privileged, indispensable, and fundamental.[1] There is, then, a mark of dependence with reference to *written* documents in the relative poverty and the divergences in the first evangelists (together with a presumption of honesty with which we are not here concerned). So flagrant a disproportion could not be explained by the hypothesis of a stereotyped oral transmission.

---

[1] On the particular case of the conclusion of *Mark* see Vol. II, Note L.

[2] *I Cor.* xv, 5–6.

And to this we must add several other arguments. When we compare together the two or the three Synoptic versions of the same fact or the same speech, we notice a great number of differences which are of a personal and literary type. They are, in fact (apart from the unusual cases mentioned above), explicable by the object and the style of each author, as we have already defined them. In a great number of cases, they suppose an original Greek text, known, emended, completed, and simplified for reasons which are obvious. The Second Gospel very often gives the impression that it has served as a basis for the others. Now to suppose that these corrections and retouchings were made from purely oral accounts would be to endow these with a fixity, enabling them to be worked over again at leisure, which could only be possessed by a written edition.

Moreover, the phenomenon of " doublets ", that is to say, of words repeated several times in a different context in the course of the same Gospel, is also more easily explained if the author has used written documents.[2] If there are to be found in two cathedrals a group of figures representing the same symbolism by the same attitudes, one is driven to the conclusion that there exists a common prototype which is reproduced by these groups, or that the one is a copy of the other. Similarly, when one at least of the passages in which the repeated word figures is to be found in a characteristic setting which is also to be seen, precisely the same, in another evangelist, the natural conclusion is that the one depends on the other in this matter, or that both have made use of the same preëxisting document. We believe that in actual fact there are instances of both of these cases.

---

[1] " It is one of the most firmly established of historic facts that the apostle Paul was not the first to stress so markedly the death and the resurrection of Jesus, but that in recognising in them so great a significance he is at one with the primitive Church. ' I have transmitted to you ', he wrote to the Corinthians, ' what I have myself received (from tradition), namely that Christ died for our sins, and that on the third day he was raised up again.' Certainly, Paul made the death and the resurrection of Jesus the object of special examination, and in some sort condensed the whole Gospel down to these two facts, but before him the personal disciples of Jesus and the primitive Church had held them to be fundamental " (Harnack: *The Essence of Christianity*, second French edition, 1907, pp. 188–189).

[2] On these " doublets " as they are found in *Matthew* (*Mark* has only one, which is still disputed, *Luke* eleven, *Matthew* twenty-two: figures given by Sir John Hawkins in his *Horae Synopticae*) see the detailed study by Lagrange: *Évangile selon saint Matthieu*, pp. xlix-lviii.

And now, in the light of these facts, let us examine once more the first three Gospels, beginning with that one to which we have the best reasons for assigning written sources.

St. Luke refers, in actual fact, in his Prologue, to " many " who before him treated the subject with which he, in his turn, is to deal. He does not explicitly refer to the written work of these pioneers, but it will be admitted that those of their versions which the authority of the most competent[1] informers would guarantee ought to figure prominently amongst the sources used by the new evangelist. This was eminently the case with St. Matthew's work, whether or not it was accessible, at least partially, in a Greek version ; and also with the teaching of Peter drawn up by Mark.

In fact, the dependence of the Third Gospel on the Second is obvious.[2] In three important sections, extending almost to a third of his work, Luke follows his predecessor step by step, sometimes adding, sometimes abbreviating and for reasons often easily seen ; rewriting and always stamping it with his own style, but retaining a host of characteristic expressions. When, in the first of the Marcan sections,[3] we find fifteen small groups taken consecutively and in the same order, without the omission of an incident or of an important idea, and without any transposition; when the second[1] offers us fifteen more fragments, without any omission and "with one sole addition which is in reality a transposition";[2] when the third,[3] with omissions and additions but in the same order and without any transposition, reproduces twenty-three Marcan "pericopes", we have the right to conclude that the case is established. St. Luke's independence of his source, displayed elsewhere, cannot weaken this evidence.[4]

---

[1] " Who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word ", *Lk.* i, 1.

[2] " That *Mark* served him (Luke) as a basis, is a thing so commonly recognised now, that there is no need to insist on it at greater length ": H. Cladder, *Unsere Evangelien*, I, p. 140. M. E. Levesque is almost alone in that, while recognising the dependence of Luke on the Roman teaching of Mark, he refuses to see in it a literary dependence: *Nos Quatre Evangiles*, Paris, 1923.

[3] *Lk.* iv, 31, to vi, 19, which follows *Mk.* i, 21, to iii, 12.

For it is very true that the author does not slavishly follow one sole source of information, even though that were his old companion of the apostolate at Rome, and Peter's interpreter. If he depends upon him for the framework and the matter of a large part of his narrative, Luke none the less has recourse to others, and makes use of them (as we can presume from the manner in which he adapts the text of *Mark*) with a singular mixture of fidelity (of "objectivity", if you like) as regards the basis and of elastic freedom in respect of the form. A good fifth of the Gospel covers again, as regards the subject treated, the same ground as our actual Gospel according to St. Matthew,[5] with constant similarity of expression, which here and there are actually identical. This certain fact implies a dependence of Luke on his predecessor, more especially as the passages which are similar almost all belong to the discourses of Christ, which form the most elaborated and characteristic parts of the First Gospel. And of what nature is this dependence? Literary, or merely traditional—Matthew's teaching (by the latter hypothesis) having reached Luke before being drawn up in Aramaic, or at least before it was translated into Greek? And if we take the first hypothesis, was it the First Gospel in its entirety, or only a portion of it, which was before the writer?[1] Here we have the puzzle of the Synoptic problem. It seems to us that a literary, though partial, dependence best corresponds to the complexity of the facts. What is certainly the fresh contribution of the Third Gospel to the history of Jesus, what is called "the particular gift of Luke" (the story of the childhood of Jesus; the "small" and the "great interpolation" in the framework provided by St. Mark;[1] and the very detailed version of the Passion and the Resurrection), hint at other sources which we can conjecture but not definitely designate.

---

[1] *Lk.* viii, 4, to ix, 50, which follows *Mk.* iv, 1, to ix, 40.

[2] Lagrange: *Évangile selon saint Luc*, Paris, 1921, p. 1. In the same work, pp. lxviii–lvii, may be seen the detailed justification for these assertions.

[3] *Lk.* xviii, 15 to xxi, 38, which follows *Mk.* x, 13 to xiii, 37.

[4] See the admirable essay by Sir John Hawkins, *Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel*, in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Oxford, 1911, pp. 27–94. He mentions at the beginning that "rather more than two-thirds of St. Luke's Gospel, viz. 798 verses out of 1,149, may be taken as generally supporting the now prevailing opinion that the compiler of (this) Gospel used the Gospel of St. Mark—pretty nearly, if not quite, as we have it—not only as one of (his) most important sources, but as a framework," p. 29.

[5] According to the figures most carefully established by Sir John Hawkins, which moreover practically coincide with the verifications made independently by Harnack: *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, in *Beitraege*, pp. 88–102. See also *The Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke*, in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 108–118; on the independence, *ibid.*, p. 112, note 1—about 277 verses of *Luke* at most, and 225 at least (out of 1,149) corresponding to 298 verses of *Matthew* at most, and 236 at least (out of 1,068).

---

[1] It is by starting from this part common to *Matthew* and *Luke* that the attempt has been made to reconstruct the famous Q document, the essential basis of the so-called Two-Sources theory. An approximate restoration is not impossible, and Harnack and Hawkins have carried it out with skill and penetration. But the document thus obtained, which contains chiefly, but not exclusively, the words of Christ—Harnack in his *Sprüche und Reden*, p. 115, discovers, in the sixty fragments of this mosaic, seven narratives, eleven or twelve parables, thirteen consecutive discourses, and twenty-nine detached or shorter ones—results in such an incoherent, headless collection, that the independence of such a fragment is highly improbable. It could not have been either a simple collection of Christ's words, or a consecutive narrative; many of the pieces which compose it presuppose a knowledge of facts not given in the document; the Passion is totally absent from it, etc. Dr. Streeter has well said that the drawing up of such a document "is perfectly intelligible as a document written to *supplement* the living tradition of a generation which had known Christ", and for which, in consequence, there was no need to recall the facts (*The Literary Evolution of the Gospels*, in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 215). This does not make probable the autonomous existence of these *disjecta membra*. "A torso, however beautiful, would not have been created for a state of mutilation": Lagrange, *Évangile selon saint Matthieu*, 1923, p. cxxiv.

To sum up, in reconstructing Q we have to choose between extracting the matter common to *Luke* and to *Matthew*, with some eventual recourse to *Mark*—this method at least rests on a solid textual basis, but it gives a monstrous result—or, on the other hand, making a conjectural restoration which may lead to a very homogeneous whole. This is what has been done, for example, by W. C. Allen: *The Book of Sayings used by the Editor of the First Gospel*, in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 235–289.

Rejecting the methods and the results obtained by Harnack, he sets out simply with the text of *Matthew*, sometimes availing himself of *Mark*, and reconstructs, conjecturally, a complete document which is without narrative and without miracles. This is arbitrariness almost uncontrolled.

The Second Gospel, so far as it is a narrative (and it is that before all, containing only one discourse of any length), is based on first-hand evidence, which everything leads us to identify with that of Peter. And Mark so well preserves the impression of spontaneity, the rude vivacity of his original, that we might almost think that he is this very witness himself. But, as we have already observed, his version, so far as the words of Christ are concerned, does not seem to be independent of what forms the essential basis of the First Gospel.[2] Is this dependence of the literary order, or is it a mere reminiscence? Each opinion can be defended by weighty arguments.

The Gospel according to St. Matthew, in its present form, does not at first give the impression of being a translation. Drawn up, as we have seen, in tolerably correct Greek, it is more carefully composed, better balanced, and richer in information and doctrine than the two others. The narrative to be found in it, compared with that of *Mark*, is summary, drier, less coloured, but more careful: its form gives less of an opportunity for rash interpretations, and sometimes absolutely prevents them. None of the other Synoptists contain so many doublets. Now all characteristics which are revealed by an attentive study of the book would lead us to believe that this Gospel is secondary and later, at least in relation to *Mark*. But categorically opposed to this conclusion, entirely founded on internal criticism, is ancient tradition, which is unanimous in according to *Matthew* priority in its basis and in its actual writing.

---

[1] The "small interpolation" is *Lk.* vi, 20, to viii, 3 (83 verses according to Hawkins); the "great interpolation" is *Lk.* ix, 51, to xviii, 14 (350 or 351 verses, according as we admit xvii, 36, as authentic or not).

[2] I fall back here on the dissertation by Streeter in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem: St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q*, pp. 166–184. Comparison of the passages common to the three Synoptists shows that *Mark*, which is habitually more complete and more highly coloured when dealing with facts, is on the other hand shorter and less spirited when relating words. In this respect only are the famous words of St. Augustine justifiable: *Marcus, . . . pedisequus et breviator Matthaei.* The fact is the more striking in that, as Swete (*The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. lxxiv) acutely and justly remarks, when he deals with instructions given in particular to the Twelve (e.g. vii, 18–23; viii, 17–21; ix, 33–50; xiii, 34–37) Mark's version is sometimes longer and marked (as are his narrative portions habitually) by touches of freshness and singular originality.

Looked at in this light (and it is the wisest[1] method in these matters to prefer an ounce of ancient information which is authentic to a bookful of learned conjectures), study of the First Gospel discloses further features. The very striking and numerous similarities of vocabulary and expression between its text and that of *Mark* accord, in the narrative portions, with a real independence as regards facts. In this respect, *Matthew* is much freer than *Luke*, while at the same time it is less so in regard to style.[2] As for the doctrinal portions, we have just seen independent critics such as Dr. Streeter, who support the priority of *Mark*, acknowledge that in the latter they have a less primitive appearance.

But, and this is of greater significance still, *Matthew*, even in its present form, possesses, together with a unity of plan and of vigorous purpose which has a command of details and in no way savours of a compilation,[3] a unity of sentiment,[4] which plainly takes us back to a very early period, anterior to the written edition of Peter's teaching. Above all, this is the Gospel which has its roots deep in the Palestinian world before the great convulsions of 66-70. "At every step we feel that Matthew is writing for those to whom Pharasaic Judaism is a very real and potent force, of mixed attraction and repulsion."[1] There is not a single page, one might say not a phrase, of his Gospel which cannot be elucidated by precedents and parallels of the rabinnical and Judaising order.[2] And on that point, whether it is a question of facts or of the manner of presenting them, of the matter of the discourses or of phraseology, there is no comparison possible between *Matthew* and the other Synoptists. *John* alone presents, in many passages, as rich a Jewish background, though it is much less exclusive. Moreover the relative correctness of the Greek text by no means excludes an Aramaic original, which is in addition made very probable by the method of composition and the choice of subjects treated ;[3] this correctness merely indicates a polishing up by a careful and well-educated translator.

---

[1] That is why the Pontifical Biblical Commission has rendered an important service to critics of all faiths by forcibly reminding Catholic exegetes of the traditional views on this point. See the decree of June 19, 1911, n. 1–5, in *Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae*, Paris, 1920, pp. 60–61, by F. Cavallera; also L. Fonck: *Documenta ad Commissionem de Re Biblica Spectantia*, Rome, 1915.

[2] "Luke very freely changes the words and the phrases in order to attain to Greek elegance, but he reproduces all the traits which give the facts their character; . . . he retains not merely the essentials but even the integrity of Mark's accounts. Now Matthew presents the opposite phenomenon. He is much nearer Mark in the choice and the order of his words, but more divergent from him in the manner of presenting facts." (Lagrange: *Évangile selon saint Matthieu*, p. lix. See also the examples on pp. lxx-lxxviii.)

[3] "Moreover it [*Matthew*] remains, if we consider it from the point of view of style, the most ancient 'book of the Gospel': the others have obtained the rank and the dignity implied by such books from the fact that they have been drawn up on the same plan as *Matthew*." Harnack, *Beitraege*, IV, p. 94.

[4] We have demonstrated this above, pp. 63 *seq.*

All these features fall into line with those we previously mentioned if we admit that our First Gospel, in the literary order dependent on the Second, has in all other respects (for what goes to make its flesh and bones) that priority which its archaism, its absence of prejudice on the points which divided the early Christians,[4] and the unanimous testimony of antiquity lead us to recognise in it. There is nothing in the first fact which should astonish us. Whether or no he was Matthew himself—a conjecture that is plausible but without support in ancient tradition[1]—the translator of the Aramaic Gospel knew very well how to adapt the frame, for other reasons hallowed in its main outlines, into which Mark had thrown, as it were alive, the teaching of Peter.

---

[1] B. H. Streeter: *The Literary Evolution of the Gospels*, in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 220.

[2] Strack and Billerbeck: *Das Evangelium nach Matthaeus erlaütert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, in *KTM*, I, 1922, II, 1924. *Matthew* by itself supplies them with more matter for consideration than the three other Gospels and the *Acts* put together.

[3] See above, p. 59 *seq.*, and for a detailed examination of Matthew's language, the study by Lagrange: *Évangile selon saint Matthieu*, pp. lxxviii–cxxiv., which concludes: " On the whole, then, it seems to us more probable that the First Gospel is a translation, in some respects very free, of a Semitic original. . . . Moreover this Semitic original was rather Aramaic (than Hebrew) ": p. cxii.

[4] In effect, if Matthew is by general consent the least " Pauline " of the evangelists, he is the most Catholic of them. Search has been made in vain in his work for anything directed against the person and the ideas of Paul (see, for example, the weakness of the suggestions made on this point by Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 522–523). The extension of the Kingdom of God to the whole world, the substitution of the Israel of God for the Israel of the flesh, the identification of the former with the Church, all that is the soul of Paul's doctrine, is clearly also that of the first evangelist.

But we must not lose sight of the unity, or rather the fundamental identity, of the apostolic teaching, nor must we forget that Matthew drew up not his personal reminiscences, but that teaching in the establishment of which it is beyond doubt that Peter played a predominant part. While modelling his narrative to a great extent on that of Peter's secretary, and especially for the order of his statements, which forms the less original part of his work, the translator knew how to preserve for his Gospel that doctrinal and literary unity which distinguishes it. With all the greater ease, without substantially altering Matthew's book, could he use his successor's expressions, together with certain episodical features, for the difficult passage of the Aramaic into Greek. But even then he knew how to preserve the character of the original work, while at the same time assuring to it that penetrating power which only the Greek tongue could then give a book.

This interdependence of our first Gospels, while doing justice to the valuable heritage of tradition, explains very naturally one of the most complex of literary phenomena. In attempting to explain it, many have perhaps too much neglected a direct and careful comparison of the texts; while others have assuredly held too cheap the information given by the earliest sources.

## 5. THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

What is the historical value of the teachings contained in the Synoptists? Independent critics are unanimous in according them very considerable value. The researches which we have just summed up led them progressively to modify, in a reactionary direction, positions which had become indefensible, regarding the date and the general authenticity[1] of the ancient Christian documents. A small synoptic table will show this at a glance for the first Gospels. The controversy over the date of the Fourth hardly any longer exists.

---

[1] "*Matthaeus, qui et Levi . . . primus in Judaea. . . . Evangelium Christi hebraicis literis verbisque composuit, quod quis postea in graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est*": St. Jerome, *De Viris Inlustr.*, III.

| | *Matthew* | *Mark* | *Luke* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strauss (1835) | At the earliest in the year 150. | | |
| Baur (1847) | 130–134 | 150 | 150 |
| Renan (1877) | 84 | About 76 | About 94 |
| Harnack (1911) | About 70 | About 65 | About 67 |

It should be noted that the last author quoted, the most illustrious Protestant theologian of contemporary Germany, considers the Marcan Gospel used by Luke about 67 to be a second edition, and that the common source (Q), which he assigns, together with the first Mark, for *Matthew* and *Luke*, may be dated " about 50, or even earlier ".[2]

" Sixty years ago," he writes elsewhere[3] " David Frederic Strauss thought that he had deprived the first three Gospels of almost all their value . . . the historical and critical labour of two generations has succeeded in restoring it to them in great measure. . . . The Gospels are not ' party documents.' . . . They belong, in their essentials, to the primitive, Judaic period of Christianity, to that short period which we may call palæontological. It is a happy accident, for which we ought to be thankful to history, that we still possess accounts dating from this period. . . . The absolutely unique character of the Gospels is to-day universally recognised by critics. . . . That in them we are, for all essentials, face to face with primitive tradition, is incontestable."

And if, from these generalities, we descend to detail, we shall notice that the same authors ordinarily distinguish in a marked fashion, placing in two categories, which they treat each by itself, the teachings of Christ and the facts of his history. The first of these categories is handled with much respect, and gives rise to generally favourable conclusions ; but the second causes much greater reserve.

---

[1] By that, I mean the attribution of a work to a setting and the time traditionally assigned to it.

[2] *Beitraege*, IV, p. 87, n. 1. On the other dates, see the same volume of *Beitraege, passim.*

[3] *The Essence of Christianity*, second French edition, pp. 32–34.

At the foundation of this difference in treatment are reasons of general philosophy, and also of technical criticism. It is obvious that the presence of a supernatural element in large quantities and in all the discernible strata of the Synoptic material, if it no longer authorizes, as in the time of Strauss, the total rejection of the Gospel narratives, does continue to render them suspect to many. We shall see this when we come to examine the miracles of Jesus. Moreover a narrative, the account of an event, is often valueless as a contribution to a direct demonstration of authenticity. On the other hand, teachings such as those of Christ, by their outstanding qualities, their novelty, their sparkling limpidity, bear in themselves the proof of their origin. It needs very strong views (or rather prejudice) to enable anyone to attribute the Beatitudes, the "Consider the lilies of the field", the "Render to Cæsar . . .", or the Parable of the Good Samaritan,[1] to the improvisation of anonymous prophets. Add to this the fact that the nature of the controversies, the position of the questions, and the allusions, furnish subtle offsets with all that we know of the state of minds, of parties and of manners at a given date. Finally, careful study of the Gospel rhythms discloses in the sermons of Jesus, beneath the individual characteristics of each writer, a continuous quality of a unique type, which is guaranteed by the literary form itself. It is often possible with the help of these indications to prove directly the authenticity of the words of Jesus ; and this proof applied in many particular cases covers, after the manner of a general presumption, all the doctrinal and didactic portions of the Synoptic Gospels. It is curious thus to observe the scruples of certain Liberal critics about employing expedients intended to demolish particularly embarrassing texts.

---

[1] "The words of Jesus", said Henri Monnier, "were clear and indestructible. . . . They could neither be imitated nor altered": *La Mission historique de Jésus*, Paris, 1914, p. xx. See also *Jesus, Man of Genius*, by J. Middleton Murry, London, 1926, pp. 162 *seq.*, 286 *seq.*

But facts do not defend themselves so well as words ; often they have in their favour nothing but their ingenuousness, and the transparent good faith of those who have noted them down. Related as they are for a doctrinal purpose, by believers for believers, by a happy chance they have preserved, incorporated in their substance, details of history, geographical minutiæ, and allusions, which enable us to judge them in themselves.

A large portion of these narratives, precisely that part which has served as a framework for at least two of the evangelists, has the benefit of Mark's very vivacious manner. At the end of a minute analysis Stanton concludes thus : "The several narratives of Mark are distinct and individual to a marvellous degree. As regards their subject-matter they have no appearance of having been cast in one mould or even in two or three moulds. The circumstances described and the characters that come before us are very various. This is rendered all the more significant as a proof that the accounts are historical by the fact that in the mode of narration, the phrases and turns of expression employed, there is a large amount of uniformity."[1]

Nor would it be difficult to point to direct indications of authenticity in the Gospel stories which are not to be found in *Mark*. Many an event is led up to by contemporary incidents which have no connection with the history of Jesus, such as those in the "particular gift" of *Luke*: the exorcist who was a stranger to the apostolic band and whom John wished to silence,[2] or the eighteen persons crushed under the tower of Siloe.[3] Others are localised and embedded in the very Galilean soil, such as the story of the centurion who had built the synagogue of Capharnaum,[4] a story which is not to be found in *Mark*. Others, finally, are not in the course of the general narrative and may betray the interest of an eye-witness.[1]

---

[1] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, II, pp. 188–189. See also the admirable studies by C. H. Turner on *The Marcan Usage* in *JTS*, 1925 and 1926.

[2] *Lk.* ix, 49–50.

[3] *Lk.* xiii, 4–6.

[4] *Mt.* viii, 5–13; *Lk.* vii, 1–10.

But the distinction between the acts and the words of the Lord which these particular considerations suppose, if it may rest on firm foundations and be authorized by ancient documents,[2] must not be pressed unduly. So far as it would insinuate a difference in the historic value of the Gospel elements, it is not only foreign, but absolutely opposed, to the thought of the Synoptists. They did not judge their material ; everything which Jesus did, everything which he said, was for them equally good, salutary, and divine. No doubt a reader who examines their testimony solely from the point of view of history (as we do in the present study) can reserve his adhesion and raise more or less specious objections against their accounts ; he may fear that fragments of later tradition may have slipped here and there into the authentic testimony. If liberal critics of to-day think they can denounce these historical weaknesses we will gladly hear their reasons ; but it is artificial and bigoted to try to establish an *a priori* difference in the matter of authority between the teachings and the acts of Christ.

This distinction, which is without any basis in the intention of the evangelists, has also none whatever in reality. The Synoptic narrative taken as a whole, as much in the part peculiar to *Luke* and the double narrative (*Matthew* and *Luke*) as in the triple synopsis (apart from differences of style) forms a very homogeneous whole. The actions attributed to Jesus are in accord with the words which are placed in his mouth. The divine note in these last is there alone and inevitably more direct. But the teachings, discourses, arguments, and parables are inextricably intermingled with the acts, the preferences, the controversies, the miracles, the journeys, the decisions, or the sufferings of the Master. We shall frequently have to affirm this below: the fact is incontestable.

---

[1] Weiss, *Literaturgeschichte des N.T.*, in *RGG*, III, col. 2181 *seq.*

[2] *Acts* i, 1; Papias, in Eusebius, *HE*, III, 39, 15, *τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα.*

It is, then, on this collection, the Synoptic material in general, that any decision as to historical value can and should be made. If anyone seeks to delete from this organic whole an event, a feature, or a word, the proof of its falseness, its novelty, its lack of authority, falls on him who wishes to disqualify that word, feature, or event. This is how one must proceed when faced with historical documents substantially worthy of belief.

Now, that such was the Synoptic tradition taken as a whole we have seen above to be the opinion of the most captious of the critics who count. In these writings, wrote Loisy in 1903, "a living Jesus deals with living men; the world which we see in action around him is a real world, the characters therein depicted have their own existence and individual natures; life permeates it, and with it the truth of the historic representation".[1] It remains for us to bring forward some of the considerations which, by furnishing, so to speak, the counter-proof of the signs given above, place this favourable judgment beyond all serious doubt.

Two historical facts, which are dated with certitude, will prove useful to us here.

The first of these is the total ruin of Jewish Palestinian society and of the people during the years 66–70. At the latter date we may say that the overthrow was completed, but from the former it was in sight and inevitable, and everything in the Synoptists which supposes an organization which is still powerful, redoubtable, and relatively autonomous in the Judaism of the Holy Land, loses all sense of reality. The authorities; the customs, so far as they are interpreted by public acts and controlling orders; the partics who have any considerable power; and the religious life which gravitates around the Temple; all are challenged and reduced to a strictly defensive attitude and a slowing down of their activities, from the beginning of the great insurrection of 66. But long before this, ever since the death of Herod Agrippa, Judea had been almost continuously restless. " The succession of Procurators was rapid between 44 and 66, and none of them seem to have enjoyed a peaceful reign from the time of Valerius Gratus or even that of Pontius Pilate. The whole country of Galilee was becoming more and more disorganised each day, and fell the prey of brigands ".[1]

---

[1] *Le Quatrième Evangile*, Paris, 1903, p. 72.

Now it is Palestinian society before these great disturbances, and in a state of comparative peace, that the Synoptic evangelists always depict, and that with an exactitude which is quite striking.[2] The horizon is limited, Galilean or Jewish. All their allusions refer to customs, language, modes of thought and political conditions which prevailed under the sons of Herod. That small world lives again, with its incredible mixture of authorities, imperial, royal, national and aristocratic. The magistracy of the Sanhedrin is still powerful and formidable : it is capable of " expelling from the synagogue ", of scourging, and of punishing offenders. The change that was to come, and which may be called the dancing of the high priests to the tune called by Agrippa, has not begun. The characteristic parties with which we shall soon be acquainted, the Sadducees, full of pride, the opportunist Herodians, the Pharisees, and even the Zealots, already compete for influence. But they are not ranged one against another as they will be in the third quarter of the century, and the extremists do not yet dominate them. All the ritual, social and international features of the Temple, the sacrifices, the religious dues, the feasts, and the solemnities are respected, held sacred, and carried out with full pomp. And everything, the exaggerated sabbatarianism of the casuists, the insolent luxury of the great sacerdotal families, the fondness of the " unspotted " for praying in the market-places, exaggerating the length of their fringes and the size of their phylacteries, the authority of the scribes and the doctors peaceably " seated in the chair of Moses ", all takes us back to a society which is not yet profoundly divided, which is not yet threatened and uncertain of the morrow, in a word to the still-flourishing Judaism of the second quarter of the century.

---

[1] F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake: *The Beginnings of Christianity, Background of Jewish History*, p. 26. And in the same work see all that fo

[2] W. Bousset. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, pp. 126–127.

And another fact enables us to be yet more precise and to justify the expression "palæontological" applied by Harnack to the material of the Synoptists considered as a whole. It, in fact, represents a doctrinal stage clearly earlier than the dogmatic developments which were certainly realised in the course of the years 50–60. In that way it is primitive, and very different to the doctrine which was common in the Church when the works in which it is expressed were definitely drawn up: different, not by contradiction, but in that it is incomplete, ambiguous and implicit.

This point emerges from a comparison of the Synoptists with St. Paul's Epistles dating from before his Roman captivity in 61. If, for example, we examine in these Epistles that part which deals with the Redemption, the capital dogma of the saving Death of Christ we find that Paul puts forward a considerable body of dogma in which the consequences of the Redemption and its spiritual applications are expressed or supposed,[1] and that he puts his forward as a doctrine coming from himself, and one as sure of being understood and followed in the Roman Church, where he had never set foot, as in that of Corinth which he had founded, and at Thessalonica as among the Galatians. There is no trace of innovation or of controversy in that.[2]

And now let us go back to the Gospel texts; we shall assuredly find there this same doctrine of the Redemption, but in germ, in outline.

---

[1] Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul,* II, pp. 191–279.

[2] "The Pauline Epistles contain not the slightest trace of any conflict with regard to the person of Christ. About other things there was debate, but about this point Paul appears to have been in harmony with all Palestinian Christians. Even the Judaizers (his most bitter opponents) seem to have had no objection to the heavenly Christ of Paul." (J. Gresham Machen: *The Origin of Paul's Religion* New York 1921, p. 135.)

## E. *The Fourth Gospel*

The fourth of the canonical Gospels, the Gospel according to St. John, has, for reasons which are not all reasonable, raised the most lively controversies and is the object of most conflicting opinions. Its spiritual value and its religious importance are not seriously disputed; on the contrary, radical critics of to-day make themselves willing echoes of the praises bestowed on this author by the greatest minds: those of Origen, Augustine, and Bossuet.[1] It is the origin and interpretation of the book, its degree of originality and its historical value, which remain the subject of dissension. And its value, especially as regards our knowledge of the Person and the teaching of Jesus, has been clearly reduced to zero by a considerable number of contemporary exegetes.[2]

It is true that a more attentive study of the work often corrects the first unfavourable impression which has been even strenuously maintained by some. This was the case with the author of the first work which truly battered in the traditional thesis, C. T. Breitschneider.[3] In actual fact he did not maintain the objections which had been expressed in his *Probabilia*, although this book continues to feed the controversy on the capital point of the comparison with the Synoptists. Everyone knows that Renan, after having ridiculed the historical value of the Johannine narrative in the first editions of his *Life of Jesus*, profoundly modified his position in the final edition. He explains himself in a dissertation in which ingenious and penetrating theories abound, side by side with most unjust criticisms of the discourses contained in the Johannine Gospel.[1]

---

[1] Luther himself, as we know, called St. John's Gospel " the only true and tender Gospel ".

[2] See, for example, the conclusions reached by M. M. Goguel in his *Introduction au N.T.*, Paris, 1924, t. II, pp. 49 *seq.*

[3] *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Johannis apostoli indole et origine . . . modeste subjecit*, C. Th. Breitschneider, Leipzig, 1820. See Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 1913, pp. 86–87. C. F. von Ammon, as long ago as 1811, and before him Edward Evansers: *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists*, etc., Ipswich, 1792 (cf. J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.*, p. 516), had anticipated Breitschneider's conclusions without succeeding in agitating opinions.

It is perhaps less well known that the opinions of the father of rationalist criticism, D. F. Strauss, had thirty years previously followed an analogous course. Here are the observations, dated at Stuttgart, 1838, which he placed at the end of the Preface to the third edition of his *Life of Jesus* (1835) : "With De Wette's *Commentary* and Neander's *Life of Jesus Christ* in my hands, I have recommenced the examination of the Fourth Gospel ; and this renewed study has shaken in my mind the value of the doubts I had conceived about the authenticity of that Gospel and the credence it deserves. It is not that I am convinced that the Fourth Gospel is authentic, but I am no longer so certain that it is not. The signs of what is worthy of belief, and of what cannot be believed, of what draws near to truth and of what draws away from it, meet and cross in such a singular manner in this Gospel (the most remarkable of all) that, in the first edition of my book, I brought forward, with exclusively polemical zeal, only the unfavourable side, which seemed to me to have been neglected. But little by little the favourable side has regained its rights ; yet I cannot, like all theologians up to De Wette, sacrifice all the objections without more ample information. As a result of this attitude my book, compared with the first edition and with the writings dictated by the opinion opposed to mine, will seem to have lost in unity; but it has, I hope, gained in truth."

And finally, in our own days, and under our eyes, Loisy who had, in his vast commentary on *Le Quatrième Evangile*,[2] treated the work as a tissue of symbols, " a theological theorem which scarcely keeps the appearance of history", assigns to it in the second revised edition of his work[1] a tolerably large share of history. An ingenious twist enables him to change his conclusions without contradicting himself. According to him, the author of the Fourth Gospel was purely a mystic, but the not too scrupulous editors of his work built his flights on to an historical basis borrowed from the Synoptists. And this last conjecture, indefensible though it be, testifies that one cannot well deny to this Gospel, as it stands, a narrative intention and actual historical value.

---

[1] *De l'usage qu'il convient de faire du Quatrième Évangile en écrivant la Vie de Jésus :* Appendix to the 13th Edition of the *Vie de Jésus*, Paris, 1867. Renan maintained his attitude in *Les Évangiles*, 1877, and *L'Église Chrétienne*, 1879, M. M. Lepin, in *L'Origine du quatrième Évangile*, Paris, 1907, p. 464 *seq.*, justly remarks that that attitude substantially coincides with that taken up by C. Weizsaecker in his famous book on the apostolic era, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, Tübingen, 1886, 1902, pp. 518 *seq.*

[2] Paris, 1903.

It goes without saying that we do not attach decisive importance to these conversions: that of Strauss was, moreover, not without later relapse. But they do at least demonstrate that the question of the historical value of the Fourth Gospel remains an open question in face of even the most independent criticism, the most detached of all dogmatic pursuits. It can even be said that it definitely remains so in spite of the attempts made to explain the whole book as a system (in some respects profoundly thought out and powerfully constructed) of allegories and of symbols interpreting in terms of history the spiritual conception of the Christian religion which the author had made his own. This hypothesis, many portions of which were anticipated by F. C. Baur and the critics of his School, was exploited to the utmost at the beginning of this century, by two French critics, Réville and Loisy.[2]

But it happened, largely owing to the second of these works, that the conjecture, pushed to its end and applied with unflinching logic to both texts and facts, has split and broken by reason of the improbabilities of detail concealed within it, which a more sober or a vaguer presentation allowed to pass unnoticed. It is no longer followed,[3] at least to such an extent, and we have just seen that Loisy was not the last to quit a position which he felt to be undermined.

---

[1] Paris, 1921.

[2] Jean Réville, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, Paris, 1901; Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, Paris, 1903.

[3] The discredit into which the purely symbolic interpretation of St. John has justly fallen does not prevent certain exegetes from reverting to it; e.g., J. Estlin Carpenter, *The Johannine Writings*, London, 1927, especially pp. 242 *seq.*, and 376 *seq.*

For the rest, independent criticism has been powerless to substitute a coherent and clear hypothesis for this unfortunate attempt at a purely symbolical explanation. On no point does liberal exegesis in this last quarter of the century present a spectacle of anarchy more consoling for the upholders of tradition. The Fourth Gospel is truly the rock of scandal which causes the most determined rationalists to stumble. It can neither be turned, nor removed from the path which leads from the Christianity of the first generation to the Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch, of Justin, and of Irenaeus. Its literary character, which is so original, and indeed unique, is not less enigmatic than its origin.[1] Some scholars would see in its narratives a series of dramatic scenes, a collection *sui generis*, midway between a tragedy and a Gospel.[2] Others see in it short stories, " romances in elaborated literary form ", the prelude of the romantic biographies of which the *Life* of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus was to be the type ![3] A third party, after placing the Fourth Gospel in the same literary group as the apocryphal Gospels (on the pretext that the authors begin to speak in the first person, and add embellishments of detail intended to increase the psychological interest), show us in John the last stage in the growing secularisation of the material of the Gospels, and conclude: "This Gospel, written in opposition to the world, is remarkably concrete, in fact it is worldly!"[1] It is plain that we are far from the uncompromising symbolism of twenty years ago, when Réville and Loisy would not see, in the persons and characteristics of the features of the Fourth Gospel, more than figures and allegories, "hardly retaining the appearance of history".

---

[1] " The position of John's Gospel in the ancient history of Christianity is in reality an enigma which, to my knowledge, is not yet to the present day solved, and has even only been obscured by the attempt made to relegate John's Gospel before all to the hellenistic sphere, rejecting the concept of the Logos, and by the effort to interpret him by means of Philonian forms and ideas." (R. Bultmann, *Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums*, in *ZNTW*, XXIV, 1925, p. 100.

[2] H. Windisch, *Der Johanneische Erzaehlungsstil*, in ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, *Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Hermann Gunkel . . . dargebracht*, Göttingen, 1923, II, pp. 174–213. The author, by his analysis and stylistic method, counts on exciting once again in the modern reader " love and veneration for this major Gospel, unique in its kind," p. 213.

[3] M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 1919, p. 45. On the *Life* of Apollonius of Tyana, see Vol. II, note P. Shortly before that of Apollonius, and much more seriously, the life of Pythagoras had also been similarly turned into hagiography and apotheosis. Cf. A. Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laerce*, Brussels, 1922.

And the discourses and dogma contained in this Gospel lend themselves to no less strangely diverse interpretations. It is a book for the initiated, maintains Loisy,[2] written by "a master of gnosticism rather than by an apostle of the faith"; "the most hellenising of the New Testament books", this Gospel "probably did not appear as a complete book drawn up for public reading . . . but rather as a collection of meditations on the subject of Christ . . . and of mystic speculations. . . . From these fragments of divine biography, no impression of reality emerges save that of the deep inspiration of faith which penetrates them", etc. "What an error this is!" replies Deissmann. The book is, on the contrary "entirely popular. We must energetically protest against the widespread opinion which gives an aristocratic and secular colouring to the Johannine texts; we have to recognize on the contrary, that its nature is as strongly popular as it is liturgical."[3]

In any case, says Goguel, let us not seek the thoughts of Jesus in the Johannine discourses of Christ: they express "the thoughts of the evangelist."[4] But in his last work, that penetrating critic J. Weiss makes a distinction. Certain sentences attributed to Jesus by *John* "have an entirely Synoptic sound"; and some comparisons are borrowed from a traditional theme; in short, "the golden grains of the words of Jesus are fashioned by the evangelist and applied by him to the scheme of his patchwork art ".[1]

---

[1] "Merkwürdig konkret, ja weltlich ist dieses unweltliche Evangelium", K. L. Schmidt, *Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgem. Literaturgeschichte,* in ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, II, pp. 131–132.

[2] *Le Quatrième Évangile,* pp. 65, 66; 56 *seq.* and *passim.*

[3] "Ganz volkstumlich", *Licht vom Osten,* p. 211 and n. 3.

[4] *Introduction au Nouveau Testament,* t. II, Paris, 1924, p. 49.

These inconsistencies, which could be multiplied, justify the severe verdict passed by one of the most important of recent commentators on *John*: " Extremist criticism has reached a point at which reasonable and sensible people should feel themselves obliged to drop behind ".[2]

### I. TRADITION

The information which has been handed down to us concerning the origin and the author of this Gospel is more copious and more detailed than that which concerns the Synoptists. But tradition, which is clear when looked at as a whole and from a height, becomes contentious and subject to endless disputes, if it is studied in one of its links. In fact the various witnesses raise problems which do not all, in the present state of our knowledge, admit of definite solutions: consequently it is only too easy for liberal critics to disperse their efforts over a very large ground and to lose both themselves and their readers in a maze of controversies. But we will not follow them thither; we will confine ourselves to what seems capable of demonstration or is of great probability.

The first fact, and one of the most convincing, is supplied to us by the Epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch (who lived under Trajan, and wrote about 107 or 110.[3] Nowhere in them are textual citations to be found, at least not long enough to set all doubts at rest,[1] but the whole work cannot well be explained except by supposing a long contact with and a real assimilation of the Johannine doctrine and spirit. One of the signs of this influence, least often mentioned but most striking, is the frequent employment of the divine name "the Father"; this appellation, which is very Johannine, is extremely rare in the other ancient Christian writings.[2] And the same influence, proclaimed in many certain allusions, is to be found in the *Odes of Solomon*, which are Christian canticles of Syrian origin recently discovered,[3] dated by practically all critics from the first half of the second century.

---

[1] *Das Urchristentum*, Göttingen, 1917, p. 616. Weiss says: " I grant that new words may have been inserted in good faith which give the sense of Jesus's ideas, as the critics suppose, without always being able to give decisive proofs that this has been the case with a number of words, particularly Johannine " (*Literaturgeschichte des N.T.*, in *RGG*, III, col. 2182).

[2] Lagrange, *Évangile selon saint Jean*, 1925, p. cxciv.

[3] The question of their authenticity, which might have been thought to have been exhausted, has been taken up again, but not added to, by H. Delafosse, *Nouvel Examen des Lettres de saint Ignace d'Antioch*, *RHLR*, II, viii, 1922, p. 303 *seq.* On this subject G. Krüger very justly remarks that " the hypothesis of error sets much greater puzzles for the critics (than does that of authenticity). The Letters are written with pathos, in a style that is full of emphasis, and they indicate as their author a man who was profoundly religious, an original theologian, and one gifted with an almost morbid sensibility ", *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, I, Das*

In his letter to the Philippians,[4] written shortly after the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, about 110 or 120, St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, quotes the first epistle of St. John, which is closely related to the Gospel, to which, in truth, it acts as an introduction. And St. Justin, in his first *Apology* (about 150), and in his *Dialogue* (about 160), makes manifest allusions to this Gospel.

None of these allusions mention his name, but taken together they are conclusive as regards the existence, in the

---

*Altertum*, by Preuschen and Krüger, second edition by Krüger, Tübingen, 1923, pp. 45–46. So, too, Harnack, *Die Briefsammlung der Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen Christlichen Briefsammlungen*, Leipzig, 1926, pp. 28 *seq.*

[1] *Phil.*, vii, 1: Τὸ *πνεῦμα* · · · *οἶδεν* · · · *πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει*, which can be compared with *Jn.* iii, 8. *τὸ πνεῦμα* · · · *οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει*, is a certain allusion, if not a textual quotation. On the other passages, see *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, 1905, pp. 81–83, and Lagrange's *Évangile selon saint Jean*, pp. xxv–xxvii, and especially the appendix to C. F. Burney's *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford, 1922, pp. 153–171, in which the subject (including the *Odes of Solomon*) is treated with a profound knowledge of the texts. He concludes: "The fact which principally concerns us is Ignatius's knowledge of the Fourth Gospel, which seems to be proved to demonstration. The manner in which he utilizes its teaching shows further that his acquaintance with it was not merely superficial, but that he had assimilated it through a familiarity extending over many years," p. 191.

[2] See F. Kattenbusch, *Das Apostolische Symbol*, Leipzig, 1900, II, p. 518 and note 57.

[3] Ed. princeps: Rendel Harris, Cambridge, 1909; translated and commented on by J. Labourt and P. Batiffol, Paris, 1911. The latest edition is by J. Rendel Harris and A. Mingana, 2 vols., Manchester, 1916–1920: *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon.*

[4] *Phil.* vii, 1; *I Jn.* iv, 2–3.

first part of the second century, not only of John's doctrine, but also of his books. What removes all doubt is the fact that during the second half, the quotations, the allusions and the number of times they are mentioned multiply, coming in from all points of the doctrinal and geographical horizon. They are to be found in the works of early Gnostics, such as Valentinus and his chief disciples, Ptolemy and Heracleon, as well as that of their great opponent Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons (about 173-180); they are also in the works of fomenters of heresy, such as Marcion, about 140, and those of his refuters Melito of Sardis (c. 160-170) and Tertullian (c. 200). So, too, with the Montanists (c. 156-172) and their orthodox adversaries, Apollinarius of Hierapolis and Apollonius; isolated witnesses such as Athenagoras (c. 177), Theophilus of Antioch (c. 181), Polycrates of Ephesus (c. 190-195), Clement of Alexandria (c. 200), Tatian (c. 175), and the author of the so-called Muratorian Canon (c. 200). Now this wide-spread belief has very great force: "In the last third of the second century there becomes current[1] the story (soon undisputed and approved by the Church) of the activity of the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee, at Ephesus, his extreme longevity, his natural death, and his composition of the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse, and the Epistles."[2] Having thus recognised the fact, which is, indeed striking, Herr Heitmüller immediately strives to whittle it away by the usual methods. "Irenaeus is the zealous herald of these views," he tells us; but Irenaeus is greatly deceived, if indeed, led on by his desire to follow the Churches of Asia, he has not invented the whole story of "the figure of the aged John at Ephesus."[3] At least, we are assured, he has read Papias quite incorrectly, and at his leisure has confused what he thought held good of Polycarp and the Ancients.

---

[1] The author himself acknowledges on the following page that St. Justin represents, as it were, an intermediate stage, that he "reveals a beginning of the influence of what became the final ecclesiastical version . . . although the Gospel might not even be an indisputable apostolic authority for him." This version, then, "began" before the last third of the second century!

[2] W. Heitmüller, *Zur Johannes-Tradition*, in *ZNTW*, XV, 1914, pp. 190–192 *seq.*

[3] This is what Edward Schwartz insinuates in the same Review: *Johannes und Kerinthos*, *ZNTW*, XV, 1914, p. 219.

Those are easy tactics, but they are ineffective, for tradition is anterior to any possible influence on the part of Irenaeus, and far outruns it. It is neither probable nor possible that the bishop of Lyons, no matter what degree of authority we assign to him (his essential work was written c. 180-185) could have by himself induced the most capable of his adversaries and contemporaries, Heracleon and Ptolemy, the disciples of Valentinus, to admit the Fourth Gospel as apostolic and Johannine. But the fact remains that they did hold it as such.[1] No more was it Irenaeus who made it credible to Montanus and his prophetesses (c. 156 or 172). It was not he who dictated to Tatian, the disciple of St. Justin, the choice of the Gospel of John among the four which he welded into one whole (c. 175), the *Diatessaron*, as containing to the exclusion of all others the apostolic tradition, and therefore true. It is superfluous to remark that such a choice supposes that the four Gospels were in practically undisputed possession in the Churches of the East (for whom the Harmony was compiled) and of the West (Tatian had been a pupil of St. Justin at Rome).

Still less could Irenaeus have influenced the Church of Pontus, of which Marcion was a member and which he left in order to come to Rome under Antoninus Pius (138) for the purpose of preaching. At that time the future bishop of Lyons was but a child. Now, "it is incontestable . . . that Marcion found the canon of the four Gospels fixed before his arrival."[2]

So we see that the attempt to attribute the origin of the tradition exclusively or principally to the error (or fraud) of

---

[1] For Heracleon, see *The Fragments of Heracleon*, by A. E. Brooke, in *TS*, I, 4, especially fragment 4, pp. 54–55. For Ptolemy, see the *Letter to Flora* transcribed in Epiphanius, *Panarion, Haer.* 33, 3, in the *CB*, Epiphanius, I, by K. Holl, pp. 450–457. The letter from Ptolemy to Flora was edited and commented upon by Harnack, *Sitzungsverichte d. K. Akad.*, XXV, 1902.

[2] Harnack, *Neue Studien zu Marcion*, *TU*, XLIV, 4, 1923, pp. 21–22: "*Kein Streit besteht, das . . . Marcion den Vier-evangeliumkanon vorgefunden hat*". And that, among the Gospels, John's was considered by Marcion to be *apostolic*, along with Matthew's, is "what the sources force us to admit". *Ibid.*, 22, n. 1.

Irenaeus is indefensible. It is therefore less a confirmation of fact than of details concerning the origin and the character of this Gospel that we shall find in the very interesting testimonies of the end of the century referring to an ancient tradition. In the *Hypotyposes*, a work which is now lost, but of which Eusebius (*HE*, VI, 14, 7) preserved a fragment, Clement of Alexandria said: "John, therefore, the last of all, seeing that the exterior features (of the life of Christ) had been well brought out in the Gospels, urged on by his disciples and moved by the Spirit, wrote a spiritual Gospel".[1]

The ancient author who wrote about the same time (the end of the second century) an authentic and analytical list of the books received in the Roman Church, knew, or thought he knew, many other things. And he insisted on certain facts, after the manner of one who defends a thesis. Nor is it difficult to guess what adversaries he had in view. He was obviously concerned with a small group of extremists, of whom we only know one by name, the Roman priest Caius, who lived under Pope Zephyrine (198-217). Caius wrote a small polemical treatise in didactic form, in which he inveighed against the sect of the enlightened in Phrygia, the Montanists. These enthusiasts, who had recruited followers for their spiritual revival even in the West (Tertullian let himself be seduced into joining them) preached a Kingdom of the Spirit, rather more dangerous (at least at the beginning) for discipline and the good sense of Christians than positively heretical. Naturally they sought support in the spiritual Gospel of John, and especially in those passages which contain the promise of the Paraclete. Hence arose for their adversaries the natural temptation to shatter the principal weapon in their hands, by rejecting the Gospel itself. To this temptation Caius fell, and he pleaded and argued against *John*, opposing to it the other Gospels. But he was strenuously resisted by Irenaeus (who does not name him) and later by Hippolytus, and does not seem to have been able to secure a following. Based on the need for discrediting a work misused by the Montanists, this ill-advised opposition to the Gospel did not outlast the anti-Montanist campaign. But in the middle of the fourth century, that great collector of heresies, St. Epiphanius, reopened the incident and coined the name *Alogi*[1] to designate these enemies of the Gospel which opens with the doctrine of the Logos. The name has stuck, but the modern enemies of John have tried to give these distant ancestors an importance which they never had. It was surely in order to combat their audacious denials that our author turned to account the circumstantial details which follow :

---

[1] The text is even more expressive, for it opposes the σωματικά to the πνευματικόν, which it is impossible to do in a translation.

### *Of the Fourth of the Gospels : Of John, One of the Disciples*

> At the request of his fellow-disciples and [fellow-] bishops[2] he said : " Fast with me three days [from] to-day and whatsoever shall be revealed to each or any one of us we will relate it." The same night, it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that, subject to revision by all of them, John must write down everything in his own name. And, although the beginnings may be different in each of the evangelical books (as they have come down to us), that in no way interests believers, since in all of them there has, been brought to light by the unique and principal action of the Spirit everything touching the nativity, the passion, the resurrection, the conversation (of Jesus) with his disciples, and his twofold advent : the first in humility and disgrace, which has already taken place ; the second in royal power and splendour, which will take place. What is there surprising, then, if John pronounces on each point

---

[1] For all the information concerning this notice by Epiphanius and his sources, see the sober and judicious comments of Karl Holl in his edition of *Panarion, Haer.* 51, *CB,* XXXI, Epiphanius, II, Berlin, 1922, pp. 249–311. On the Montanists, the work of P. de Labriolle: *La Crise Montaniste, les sources de l'Hist. du Montanisme*, Paris, 1913, is authoritative.

[2] This touch is equally stressed in Clement of Alexandria (cf. p. 141) and several times in St. Jerome. He speaks here of the last Asiatic bishops, who may well be called " his " bishops, in speaking of John.

> with so much authority, even in his Epistles, saying of himself: "What we have seen with our eyes and have heard with [our] ears, and what we have touched with our hands, that is what we write to you". For it is thus that he makes his profession of being, not only an eye-witness and a hearer, but also a historian of all the marvels of our Lord according to a certain order.[1]

It goes without saying that only with reserve can we accept all the details given here. What is striking is to notice the point (stressed by the author) which is connected with the chief argument of our adversaries, drawn from the incompatibility of the Johannine version of the start of the preaching of the Gospel with the version of the Synoptists. Hippolytus, in his refutation of Caius, had already raised this point (as we know from the extracts preserved for us by Denys bar Salibi, a Syrian writer of the twelfth century): it is drawn, plainly, from internal criticism of the documents, and not from the tradition concerning them.

The personal testimony of St. Irenaeus to this Gospel is as clear and explicit as it could be, considering its brevity: "Then John, the disciple of the Lord, he who had reclined on His breast, gave also [his version of] the Gospel, while he dwelt at Ephesus"[2] (*Adv. Haer.*, III, i; in Greek in Eusebius, *HE*, V, 8, 4). At the time when the Bishop of Lyons was writing his work (c. 185) the tradition on the Johannine origin of the Fourth Gospel was firm and (except for the quite local and prejudiced opposition of Caius) general. But Irenaeus, by reason of his origin and his qualifications, remains a witness without an equal in value. If he was rather a theorist and a theologian than a historian or an exegete, he was none the less habitually sure and safe when speaking of persons whom he had personally known. Tertullian called him "a very painstaking enquirer in matters of doctrine", and the most exacting critics recognise in him an historical source of the first order[1] for the Gnostics of the second generation (Ptolemy, Heracleon, and Markos). *And* he had known St. Polycarp: for this we have much ancient testimony, and, which is more, that of Irenaeus himself. He states it in the clearest terms on two occasions. About 190, writing to Florinus, a friend of childhood whose orthodoxy had been shipwrecked, the bishop of Lyons said:

---

[1] Muratorian Canon, ll. 9–34; text revised from the original by E. S. Buchanan, in *JTS*, VIII, p. 540. I have tried to retain the rugged style of the passage as we have it in the Latin, adding only the punctuation and a few indispensable words.

[2] Cf. E. de Faye in F. Vernet: *Irénée*, in *DTC*, VII, 2, col. 2511.

> "These opinions, Florinus, to speak very mildly, are not those of sound doctrine: they do not agree with (the teaching of) the Church . . . these opinions are not in the tradition of the ancients, our predecessors, who were disciples of the apostles. While I was still young, in Asia Minor, in the company of Polycarp, I saw you when you were at the imperial court and striving to gain his esteem. For I remember the events of those days better than recent happenings (our memories of childhood unite with our soul so as to be almost identifiable with it).[2] So well do I remember it all that I could tell the place where the blessed Polycarp sat himself down to teach, and his manner of entering and of going out, his way of living, and the beauty of his appearance, the discourses he gave to the people, and the familiar conversation which he had with John and with the others who had seen the Lord, as he has related and has recalled their words. And what he heard from them concerning the Lord, his miracles, his teaching, the

---

[1] We must except E. Schwartz, whose rancour against Irenaeus is proverbial. For example, in his *De Pionio et Polycarpo*, Göttingen, 1905, p. 33, Schwartz accuses Irenaeus of having, by an "audacious lie", led Eusebius to pass over in silence all the merits of Pionius, with the exception of his martyrdom, and that in flagrant contradiction to what Pionius had related in his life of St. Polycarp. Now the *Vita Polycarpi* attributed to Pionius is a much later composition, which has nothing to do with the martyr Pionius. See H. Delehaye: *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires, Brussels*, 1921, pp. 51–59; and Carl Schmidt: *Gespraeche Jesu mit seinen Jungern*, etc., *TU*, 3rd series, XIII (XLIII of the Collection), 1919, pp. 705–725.

[2] In Plato's *Timaeus*, Critias says in like fashion: "So true is it that we have an astonishing memory for all that we have learnt in our youth."

> details concerning those who had seen with their eyes the Word of Life, as Polycarp related it, and all in conformity with the Scriptures (all these do I remember). All that has since then by the mercy of God devolved upon me; I listened carefully, and I engraved it, not on papyrus, but in my heart and for ever. By the grace of God, I remember it exactly".[1]

There follows an exhortation to Florinus, with a recollection of Polycarp's letters in which the same doctrine is to be found. And elsewhere Irenaeus, making use of the testimony of Polycarp against the heresiarchs Valentinus and Marcion, characterises it thus:

> "And Polycarp was not only instructed by the apostles, and had converse with many of those who had seen Christ, but he was also established by the apostles in Asia, as bishop of the Church which is at Smyrna. *And we ourselves saw him in the flower of our age*, for he was long preserved, and passed out of life gloriously in extreme old age by the noble gate of martyrdom . . .".[2]

But some may object to this and maintain that Irenaeus was not the disciple of Polycarp, but only an occasional hearer of him. Yet it remains most certain that he had known him in his youth, and that the bishop of Smyrna was surrounded by a veneration which fixed the attention of his young friend. And it is no less certain that Polycarp died a martyr, "having followed Christ for eighty-six years", in February 155, and that Irenaeus, who in 177 succeeded St. Pothinus at the head of the Church of Lyons, was in close touch on the one hand with the Church of Rome, whither

---

[1] Fragment II, Harvey, II, pp. 471–473, in Eusebius, *HE*, V, 20, 4; Ed. Schwartz, I, 482–484.

[2] *Adv. Haer.*, III, 3, 4: ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ. Dodwell and Harvey, working on the method of reckoning years in Irenaeus, are of opinion that this "first flower of age" would correspond roughly to his twentieth year. Lagrange thinks he would be from "fifteen to twenty years old, say eighteen": *Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. xliii.

Polycarp had made a celebrated journey in the time of Pope Anicetus, and on the other hand with the Churches of Asia, of which the same Polycarp was the living model. In these circumstances is it really, I do not say probable, but possible, that the bishop of Lyons was deceived over the identity of John who had been Polycarp's master and later the surety for his teaching ?—It seems that merely to put the question is to answer it.

And, in fact, no one would have any difficulty in recognising this, were it not for the passage in which Papias, " the hearer of John, the companion of Polycarp " (these are Irenaeus's own terms for him, *AH*, V, 33, 4) speaks of the sources he has used in his *Five Books of Exegesis on the Oracles of the Lord* (cf. p. 74). Here is the passage, almost too well known, as it is preserved for us by Eusebius (*HE*, III, 39, 3) :

> " I would not be sparing in mingling with my remarks [on these sources] all that I have lately learnt and retained [of the teaching] of the ancients, being well assured of the truth [of their words.] For I never took pleasure, as do the vulgar, in listening to the great orators, but rather to those who taught the true [tradition]. I did not listen to those who called to mind profane commandments, but to [the men] who spoke of the precepts imposed on our faith by the Lord and emanating from the Truth himself. And if there unexpectedly arrived one of those who had followed the ancients, I received information of the discourses made by the ancients : what Andrew or Peter, Philip or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord used to say ; and also what is said by Aristion or John the Elder (disciples of the Lord[1]). For I consider that such great profit cannot be drawn from books as from oral tradition, living and enduring."

Now if we attentively examine these words, leaving aside for the moment the glosses, controversies and commentaries which have stirred, obscured, and often drowned them, we shall certainly see that, taken straightforward, they come down to this: Papias held in estimation and lauded, greatly lauded in his *Exegeses*, the traditions of the ancients which had reached him by word of mouth; he always took care that he should be informed of them, and he faithfully retained them. For a similar reason, how should he not prefer above all else that which referred to the Lord, the very Truth? For the details which he had not himself received from the mouths of men of the apostolic generation, he had recourse to occasional informants with whose help he became acquainted with traditions derived either from the conversation (in the past) of the apostles themselves (seven of them are mentioned, belonging to the College of the Twelve), or (in the present) from that of the two disciples of the Lord: Aristion and John the Elder [Presbyter or Ancient].

---

[1] These words are not in the Syriac version, and, following Mommsen, Lagrange believes that they have been interpolated: *Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. xxxiii.

There is no decisive reason which weakens this interpretation of the text which distinguishes between John the Apostle, mentioned in the first group, and John the Elder, in the second. Eusebius, who was able to read, since he had the immense advantage of possessing, the complete work of Papias, understood him in this sense, and notes that the bishop of Hierapolis reports in fact a certain number of traditions attributed by name to John and to Aristion. The nature of the passages borrowed from the first, if we compare them with those which St. Irenaeus quotes as coming from the ancients, and which he received almost certainly from Papias, do not commend the purity of that source, although they bear witness to the authority of the Fourth Gospel which these passages criticise without discretion.[1]

It is true that, apart from the actual text of Papias, no author mentions this John the Elder, as distinct from the

---

[1] For instance, on the age of Christ, cf. *Adv. Haer.*, II, 22, 5, *Jn.* viii, 57; on his temporary sojourn before the definitive entry into Heaven, *Adv. Haer.*, V, 36, 1, *Jn.* xiv, 2; on the state of the elect, with explicit recourse to Papias, *Adv. Haer.*, V, 33, 3 and 4 (but not the group of traditions *Adv. Haer.*, IV, 27–32, which are borrowed from a refuter of Marcion, as Harnack, among others, has realised). On the whole matter, see Lagrange, *Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. xxxiv *seq.*

Apostle, before St. Denis of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century. But the argument from silence, rarely decisive, is of value here only against those who assign to an Ephesian priest an excessive part, by making him the author of the Fourth Gospel. Neither Eusebius nor Denis of Alexandria ever dreamed of such a thing. What we can probably assign to Aristion's companion is a place, and perhaps the principal place, among those ancients who informed and sometimes misled Papias and, through the latter's *Exegeses*, Irenaeus. We may also see in him one of those who, in the epilogue of St. John's Gospel, affirm so gravely the truth of the author's testimony: "This is that disciple who giveth testimony of these things and hath written these things, *and we know that his testimony is true*" (*Jn.* xxi, 24).[1]

Whatever we may think of these conjectures, we can see that the disclosures by Papias as to the sources of his work leave the testimony of Irenaeus on the apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel untouched in its integrity.

## 2. THE SUPPORT FOR TRADITION IN THE GOSPEL

After examining tradition, whose voice, slightly confused at first, becomes later distinct and morally unanimous, we must consult the book itself, and first the hints to be found in it relative to its author. For, unlike his completely anonymous predecessors, this writer calls himself several times a disciple of Jesus, and even " the disciple whom Jesus loved "[1] with predilection. In Johannine language this word " disciple " covers and replaces the term " apostle ",[2] doubtless as not suggesting any association of ideas with a particular function of the apostolic age.

---

[1] I do not mean to say that all obscurity has been removed, or that the less natural explanations of Papias's perplexing text are indefensible. Those of Th. Zahn: *Apostel und Apostelschuler in der Provinz Asien*, in *Forschungen zur Geschichte des N.T. Kanons*, Leipzig, 1900, pp. 1–224, which, starting from the identity of expression: *disciples of the Lord*, used by Papias to denote the two most important of his indirect informants, conclude that the two Johns are identical and justifies the second mention by the fact of the survival of John, have been taken up again with a few amendments by several excellent critics such as Otto Bardenhewer, and M. Lepin: *L'Origine du quatrième Évangile*, Paris, 1907, Ch. III, pp. 73–179.

Dom John Chapman has since proposed a more qualified interpretation: *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford, 1911. He recognises that two groups, apostolic and presbyteral, must be distinguished. Yet, the designation of Ancient, or Presbyter, given to John in the second group, does not in his case involve a real distinction from John the Apostle, named for the first time in the apostolic group. And this because the Apostle himself took this title of Ancient and made it a personal designation. Continuing, Abbot Chapman shows clearly that John the Ancient remains a more or less nebulous figure. We would not ask better than to suppress it, if we were, like Renan, to give way to the temptation to blot out the mention of John in Papias's first enumeration. This would greatly, but unduly, simplify the problem.

Although he only appears under this name during the Last Supper, the beloved disciple can be identified with one of the two disciples of John the Baptist (only the other, Andrew, being mentioned by his name) who formed the first nucleus of Christ's immediate circle. (*Jn.* i, 35–40). It is not rash to see him again in the " other disciple " who accompanied Simon Peter after the arrest of our Lord and introduced his companion into the court of the High Priest (*Jn.* xviii, 15).

In any case it is certain that this disciple, intimately mixed up with the most important events in the Gospel story, is a man of flesh and blood, not a personified abstraction or a symbolic figure. He intervenes in definite episodes, and bears witness to circumstantial facts, and plays a part which cannot be cut out of the story without destroying the frame completely.[3] In particular, there is nothing more natural or more probable than his part at the Last Supper. At the declaration of Jesus that one of those present would betray him, the apostles sat confused, not knowing of whom the Master spoke, and not daring to ask. But Simon Peter, seeing " the disciple whom Jesus loved " in an attitude which made a discreet question possible, made him a sign and whispered :

---

[1] Εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ • · · ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς (*Jn.* xiii, 23; ὃν ἠγάπα, xix, 26; . . . ὃν ἐφίλει, xx, 2; ὃν ἠγάπα, xxi, 7, 20). On the meaning of these words, cf. Horn in *RAM*, VI (1925), pp. 278–283 and 379.

[2] The apostles are called, together with the saints and the prophets, " the twelve apostles of the Lamb ", in the *Apocalypse* xviii, 20; and xxi, 14.

[3] This has been fully realised by Walter Bauer (*Das Johannes-Evangelium*, 1925, p. 168) amongst others, in opposition to the upholders of the allegorical exegesis, Réville and Loisy, (whom he does not name) and also to Ed. Schwartz, on the last occasion in *ZNTW*, 1914, p. 128. On the difficulties of Loisy, see Lepin: *L'Origine du quatrième Évangile*, 1907, p. 483 *seq.*, and *La Valeur historique du quatrième Évangile*, Paris, 1910, I, pp. 450 *seq.*, 553 *seq.*

" Who is it of whom he speaks ? " The same kind of thing occurred on Calvary, and at the edge of the lake.

Now the beloved disciple, who appears at first as an eyewitness and guarantee of the episode of the piercing with the lance (" And he that saw it hath given testimony : and his testimony is true. And he[1] knoweth that he saith true : that you also may believe " : *Jn.* xix, 35), later on is clearly and without any possible equivocation presented as the author of the Gospel : " This is that disciple who giveth testimony of these things and hath written these things : and we know that his testimony is true ".

It is true that these last words appear in the final chapter which acts as an appendix to the rest of the Gospel, but despite a very few critics, most of whom are newcomers to the domain of exegesis,[2] this fragment is becoming more and more commonly assigned to the author of the Gospel. In all the vast mass of manuscripts, versions, and commentaries, there is no trace of a single example of the book in which this ending does not appear. Even Tatian includes it in his *Harmony*, written as early as 175. It is joined to what precedes it by details which are all the more certain in that they are the less stressed and at first sight the less visible. Moreover the juncture is clear, and in no way apologized for : the first ending is preserved, and there is no trace of remodelling or patching up. On the contrary, throughout the fragment, there is the same Johannine tone, the same style, the same persons, the same vocabulary, and the same colouring. We can say with assurance that the literary question no longer exists.[1] But on the other hand the historical question remains sharply disputed, for the words we have quoted contain the solution of the problem raised by the anonymity of the beloved disciple. According to it, as Loisy has well understood, " it is he who is John, the disciple, the apostle, the irrefutable witness to Christ, the author of the book which is now presented as a Gospel to the Christian communities ".[2] That is well said ; too well, for the subtle critic is forcing matters somewhat in order the better to bring out their improbability. The truth is that the testimony of the ancients, the editors or vouchers for the Gospel, is extremely discreet in its distinctness and is no way out of tune with the reserved and modest fashion in which " the beloved disciple " is first introduced. No more here than elsewhere is he named or described otherwise than as the familiar friend of Jesus, and, in his turn " the faithful and true witness."[3] The point is that here we are dealing with a Gospel—not with a prophecy, an apocalypse, or a letter in which the citation of the name of the author is demanded by the style of writing. Moreover, the information undoubtedly above all bears upon the identity of the beloved disciple with the author of the Gospel. That assurance was sufficient. What follows it (" we know that his testimony is true ") aims less at strengthening the work than at consolidating it, such as it is, with the group of ancients, and, by them, with apostolic tradition in general. And it is plain from the general nature of the phrase, and still more from its tone, that it refers to the whole Gospel, and not merely to the last episode. And the enemies of the Johannine origin of the Gospel know this so well that they tend to discredit and ignore this embarrassing text without more ado. " That *Jn.* xxi, 23–24 is a complement added by another hand ought to be incontestable. But the fate of *Jn.* xxi, 1–22 should not be separated from the rest. By the mere presence of verses 30–31 [*sic ;* presumably 20–21 is meant, since 30–31 do not exist] without speaking of the rest—the whole of chapter xxi indisputably betrays itself as an appendix by a different hand" (W. Heitmüller, *Zur Johannes-Tradition*, in *ZNTW*, XV, 1914, p. 204. There follows an explanation, at once naïve and astute, of the way in which the circle of disciples of John the Elder composed the Gospel and then "launched" and "stamped" it as the work of the well-beloved disciple! "In this school which surrounded John the Elder, there were retailed, we must suppose, the words of the Lord, and expositions of the longer narrations which were attributed rightly or wrongly to the said John. They were put into writing, and these were the materials out of which this Gospel was elaborated—covered by the authority of John." (*Ibid*, pp. 207, 208.) It is as simple as that, and all is well for those who have their theory ready made. But others are less accommodating.

---

[1] 'Εκεῖνος, emphatic and solemn, is an appeal to Christ himself, conformable with the Johannine usage, *I Jn.* ii, 6; iii, 3, 5, 7, 16; iv, 17. See Zahn: *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Leipzig and Erlangen, 1921, p. 670 *seq.*, who quotes the paraphrase by Erasmus: " *Nouit et ipse Jesus quod testis ille uera praedicat* . . ." etc., *Paraphr. in Ev. Joh.*, Bale, 1523. Bauer (*Das Johannes-Evangelium*, pp. 220–221) thinks that this meaning is not necessarily correct, and that the other (which sees in *he* merely a synonym for the disciple) is nearer to the text. Quite so, but the former is certainly more satisfactory, conformable to John's language, and to numerous precedents. Lagrange (*Evangile selon saint Jean*, p. 500) adds that of Pythagoras, whom his disciples similarly called after his death 'Εκεῖνος ὁ ἀνήρ: see Iamblicus, *Life of Pythagoras*, XXXV, n. 265, and A. Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore*, Brussels, 1922.

[2] Meyer (*Ursprung und Anfaenge*, I, 1921, p. 315) is the only important modern writer who attributes chapter xxi to another hand than that which wrote the rest of the book.

---

[1] See the very solid arguments brought forward by Zahn in *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 689 *seq.*, and the forcible summary by Bauer: *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, pp. 228–229.

[2] Loisy: *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, etc., 1922, pp. 628–629. Needless to say, Loisy sees in these words only an audacious invention, an " editorial fiction ", " a literary fraud ", p. 630.

[3] Ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, *Apoc.* iii, 14.

From that general attribution and from the foregoing suggestions which it confirms, there issues the identity of the beloved disciple with John, the son of Zebedee. It is clear first that this favoured one belongs to the intimate circle, the habitual disciples of Jesus, then certainly that he is of the Twelve, and very probably that he is one of the privileged three.[1] Now, John, the son of Zebedee and the brother of James, is the only one who fulfils all these conditions of the problem. Negatively, he is indicated by the author's care to efface his name and that of his relatives from his history. While the two brothers who were sons of Jonas, Andrew and Peter, are called by their names from the beginning, and frequently reappear on the scene, precise details being given of them,[2] the second couple who were disciples of the Baptist and became followers of Jesus, although a certain allusion stresses their part from the start, remain entirely in the shade. Neither James, nor John, nor their mother Salome, nor their country are named in the Fourth Gospel, though the other three are full of them. Once only, in the appendix, if these words belong to the primitive text,[1] are "the sons of Zebedee" mentioned. Everywhere else, and even where the synoptic tradition would seem to necessitate such mentions, a profound silence covers these. Anyone who has once realised the significance of this sign can see transparently the figure engraved in filigree in the document. The beloved disciple positively holds in regard to Jesus a place which only James or John, according to the concurring testimony of the other Gospels, could have held. But between the two brothers there is no hesitation possible, and there is not even a beginning of probability in favour of James by reason of the certain date of his death[2] (in 44: *Acts* xii, 2).

---

[1] *Mk.* i, 29 and parallel passages; iii, 16, 17 and parallels; v, 37, and *Lk.* viii, 51; ix, 2 and parallels (*cf.* also x, 35 *seq.* and parallels); xiv, 33 and parallels.

[2] Andrew is named five times, Simon Peter twenty-eight times. We are told that both of these, and also Philip, came from Bethsaida, and that Simon is called Cephas by Jesus, etc.

But of what use is it to insist? It is precisely because these indications join on to those of tradition and blend into history that liberal criticism has striven for the last century to show that the Johannine attribution of the work has not, when we examine the Gospel itself, more than a feeble degree of probability. This is what we are going to examine. But first, we must deal with a recent attack whose success would render useless all discussion on the Johannine authenticity, if not the historical value and the ancient and apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel.

---

[1] See Lagrange's *Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. 522, which suggests a marginal note which has passed into the text at *Jn.* xxi, 2. See also Zahn: *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 691.

[2] Even those who, for reasons which we will demonstrate further on, do not admit the Johannine authenticity are obliged to acknowledge that the author (or responsible editor) of the work gives himself out to be John, the son of Zebedee, and wishes to be accepted as such. "That anyone could doubt it", says Ed. Meyer, "is one of those things in modern (liberal) criticism which remain incomprehensible to me": *Ursprung und Anfaenge*, I, p. 312. As regards the anonymity question, the same historian quotes analogous examples of it in classical literature, notably the *Hellenica* of Xenophon. On the theory called after Delff, see Note H below.

It is Schwartz[1] who, following up and greatly developing a suggestion by Wellhausen,[2] caused this objection to carry weight with many. Under the brutal form which he has given it, and despite the erudition expended in defending it, we may say that it is a defiance of all history. It consists, says Zahn sharply, "in delivering to the sons of Zebedee an antedated death-warrant".[3] Three principal arguments are invoked, which we must briefly pass in review: the saying of Jesus on the fate of James and John,[4] the testimony of Papias, and that of the Martyrologies.[5] The first is the starting-point of the whole theory, the principal generator of the myth, we might say.

> "*And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come to him, saying: Master, we desire that whatsoever we shall ask, thou wouldst do it for us. But he said to them: What would you that I should do for you? And they said: Grant to us that we may sit, one on thy right hand and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. And Jesus said to them: You know not what you ask. Can you drink of the chalice that I drink of, or be baptised with the baptism wherewith I am baptised? But they said to him: We can. And Jesus said to them: You shall indeed drink of the chalice that I drink of; and with the baptism wherewith I am baptised you shall be baptised. But to sit on my right hand or on my left is not mine to give to you, but for them for whom it is prepared. And the ten, hearing it, began to be much displeased at James and John.*[6]

---

[1] Schwartz: *Ueber den Tod der Soehne Zebedaei, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Johannesevangelium*, Göttingen, 1904; and, of later date, a quantity of articles, especially in *ZNTW*, XI, 1910, pp. 89–102: *Noch einmal der Tod der Soehne Zebedaei;* and XV, 1914, pp. 210–221, *Johannes und Kerinthos.*

[2] Wellhausen: *Evangelium Marci*, Berlin, 1903, p. 90; *Evangelium Johannis*, Berlin, 1908, passim. J. Weiss, *ZNTW*, XI, 1910, p. 167, *Zum Martyrertod der Zebedaeiden*, has claimed priority for the suggestion.

[3] Zahn, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Leipzig and Erlangen, 1924, I, pp. 83–100. I have made much use of this profound work.

[4] *Mk.* x, 35–40. *Mt.* xx, 20–23.

[5] Heitmüller, *Zur Johannes-Tradition*, *ZNTW*, XV, 1914, pp. 189–190, sets them out with much brevity and clearness in that order.

[6] *Mk.* x, 35–41. If we want to see what becomes of the most lifelike texts under critical vivisection we can read Bultmann's analysis of the "sources" of this episode. Here it is, without a word of commentary: "But even the apophthegm,

Whether we take these words as an exact account of an actual occurrence or as a prophecy modelled on the event (*vaticinium ex eventu*), they are in any case sufficient evidence of the fact that the sons of Zebedee, James and John, suffered the death of martyrdom. And the most simple and natural interpretation of them will always be that the two underwent martyrdom together. Now, according to *Acts*, xii, 1 *seq.*, James was put to death by Herod Agrippa, i.e., about the year 44 ".[1]

But it is precisely this last detail, the only incontestable one, which ought to raise doubt about the interpretation thus proposed ; for to make John, the son of Zebedee, die in 44 is, we repeat, a defiance of history. *Acts* says nothing of it, and in this case the argument from silence is very strong, because the author of *Acts*, who names James once only outside this passage (and that in the general list of the Twelve : i, 13), and who there calls him " the brother of John " (xii, 2), places, on the contrary, the acts of the latter in full prominence. In association with Peter, John held the first place in the Jerusalem community from its very start ; and it is therefore quite improbable that, if he had shared the tragic fate of his brother, the completion of his merit and his glory as a witness to Christ should have been passed over in silence. To this reason, which is conclusive in itself, there must be added the evidence of *Galatians*[2], from which it clearly appears that Paul, when he went up to Jerusalem " fourteen years after " his first

---

verses 35–40, is by no means a simple construction. The request in verse 37 produces two replies: verses 38–39 (the road which leads to glory passes through martyrdom), and verse 40 (the rejection of the petition, without further reference to 38–39). And surely these verses 38–39 (an obvious *vaticinium ex eventu*) are a secondary element, which can only with difficulty stand alone, and are manifestly interpolated into this place. The remainder, 35–37, and 40, seems a unique composition, and must be held to be the creation of the primitive community, when we reflect (and this is also my opinion) that the allusion to the Messianic function of Jesus, as coming from himself, would only be possible in the Christian communities ": *Die Geschichte des Synopt. Tradition*, Göttingen, 1921, pp. 10–11.

[1] Heitmüller: *Zur Johannes-Tradition*, in *ZNTW*, XI, p. 89.

[2] *Gal.* ii, 9.

journey,[1] which itself was separated by three years from his conversion[2] (say at least sixteen years from the latter)[3] to demonstrate his teaching to the leaders of the Church, and to learn from them whether his course was or had been vain,[4] conducted his business with James, the brother of the Lord, with Peter and with John " who seem to be pillars ",[5] and who gave him the right hand of fellowship in sign of union. Now it is undeniable that the John here spoken of was the son of Zebedee, and that is why Schwartz and Wellhausen, and those who, like them, seek to make him die in 44 at the latest, are forced to put in the past tense what St. Paul speaks of in the present in his epistle,[6] to contradict the clearest indications in the *Acts*,[7] and to put forward, for the sake of their thesis, the date of St. Paul's conversion and the whole chronology of the apostolic times by several years! This is so radical a mode of acting that many of those who hold out for the martyrdom of John seek another occasion for it, and fix it by a guess at about the year 70.[8] But these are pure suppositions, which avoid, it is true, the grave distortion of history caused by the earlier date, but obviously reduce to nothing the argument drawn from the text of St. Mark. And this text, which Schwartz declares to be " as clear as the sun ", especially as according to him it closely followed the actual facts, did not appear as clear to ancient Christianity. On the contrary, it seemed an enigma, and numerous methods of resolving it have been tried—save that one which nowadays seems so simple to our liberal critics : retouching or suppressing the words of the Saviour !

---

[1] *Gal.* ii, 1.

[2] *Gal.* 1, 18.

[3] For the πάλιν ἀνέβην of *Gal.* ii, 1 refers to a first journey (" After fourteen years I went up again ") and not to Paul's conversion.

[4] *Gal.* ii, 2.

[5] *Gal.* ii, 9.

[6] Οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι, *Gal.* ii, 9, cf. ii, 2, 6. See Lagrange: *Épître aux Galates*, Paris, 1918, pp. 22 *seq.* The way in which Schwartz alters the apostolic chronology may be seen in *ZNTW*, XI, pp. 100 *seq.* He fixes the conversion of St. Paul at 28–29 and concludes: " The harvest of God may have ripened quickly ". But, at the expense of the word of God, he greatly assists it in ripening.

[7] *Acts* xii, 25; xiii, 5, 13; xv, 37 *seq.*

[8] For example, Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh, 1920, I, p. xlix: " He (the apostle John) was alive when Paul had his conference with the ' pillar-apostles ' in Jerusalem (*Gal.* ii, 9). This was not later than A.D. 64. Since he was martyred by the Jews, he must have died before A.D. 70 ", p. xlix. So, too, Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 137, speaks of A.D. 70; and Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 433, says: " even if he (John) was martyred (as some suggest) shortly after the outbreak of the Jewish War in A.D. 66 ".

The author who, under the name of Leucius Charinus, wrote, " not later than the middle of the second century ",[1] the earliest apocryphal *Acts* known, employed himself in explaining how John was martyred under Domitian. He was forced to take a cup of poison, but the venom had no power to hurt him.[2] According to another Western tradition, known even to Tertullian, John was plunged into a vat full of boiling oil.[3] But much more striking than these anecdotes are the words of the last chapter of the Gospel itself concerning the end of the well-beloved disciple : after having confirmed Peter in his position as leader and supreme pastor, Christ foretold for him his bloody death :

> " Amen, amen, I say to thee, when thou wast younger, thou didst gird thyself and didst walk where thou wouldst. But when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee and lead thee whither thou wouldst not. And this he said signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when he had said this, he said to him : Follow me. Peter turning about, saw that disciple whom Jesus loved following, who also leaned on his breast at supper and said : Lord, who is he that shall betray thee ? Him therefore when Peter had seen, he saith to Jesus : Lord, and what shall this man do ? Jesus saith to him : So I will have him to remain till I come, what is it to thee ? Follow thou me. This saying therefore went abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die. And Jesus did not say to him : He should not die ; but : So I will have him to remain till I come, what is it

---

[1] James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. xx and 228. Zahn, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, I, p. 25, says " about 160–170 ".

[2] In the Greek in *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, ed. by M. Bonnet, II, 1, 1898, n. 9; in the Latin in the *Historia Apostolica* of Abdias, Bk. V, n. xix.

[3] Tertullian, *De Praescriptione*, xxxvi, Ed. by P. de Labriolle, 1907, p. 78, coll. LX.

to thee? This is that disciple who giveth testimony of these things and hath written these things; and we know that his testimony is true." (*Jn.* xxi, 18–25.)

If there is anything clear in this passage, it is that it refers to a disciple of importance, to a "pillar" of the ancient Church, in St. Paul's phrase, and one who played towards Peter the part constantly attributed to him in the book of the *Acts* and in the Fourth Gospel. To interpret this of a John the Elder of Ephesus, or, as Schwartz suggests, of John Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, disciples of the second generation, is merely ludicrous. John the apostle alone and his fate can be thus compared with the person and the fate of Peter, the head of the Church.

Moreover (whether the allusion to his death be made with the object of defending the truth of our Lord's statement, or whether the time of his death remains indeterminate and the object here is simply to prevent the rise of a legend concerning him), the beloved disciple here in question long survived Peter, and reached extreme old age, which fact alone gives any sense to the episode.

We have, then, the alternatives of a lengthy and (by reason of the more natural meaning of the prophecy made by Jesus to the sons of Zebedee) to some extent unexpected survival of John the Apostle, and of the deliberate fabrication of a "tradition" containing several words of Jesus, tending to make it credible. Well, I fancy that from the mere point of view of history few who are familiar with the evangelical documents will hesitate to accept the first hypothesis.

No doubt there remains to be explained, in this case, how John "drank the chalice of the Lord" and was "baptised with his baptism". That these metaphors, familiar and classical, alluded to the Passion of Jesus no one can doubt, and in Christian antiquity no one did doubt it. But there are more ways than one of being a martyr, as Origen and Chrysostom[1] well understood. "To drink the chalice" is a phrase used in the Old Testament in connection with any trial sent by God. Long before the final stroke of the sword had terminated his life, Paul had undergone the great "tribulations which came to us in Asia Minor: pressed out of measure above our strength, so that we were weary even of life" (II *Cor.* i, 8). Long had he "borne the marks of the Lord Jesus" in his body (*Gal.* vi, 17); and long had he by his sufferings "filled up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ" in his flesh (*Col.* i, 24). Are we to think then that he had not yet "drunk the chalice" of his Master and participated in his bloody baptism?

---

[1] See their interpretation, and the biblical antecedents of the expression "drink the chalice", in Zahn, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, I, p. 94, n. 78. It refers to a great trial sent by God.

The testimony of Papias and that of the Martyrologies (cited above), although the former is not free from difficulties, will not detain us so long. There seems no doubt that the old Bishop of Hierapolis admitted that John was "removed",[1] put to death by the Jews. This knowledge comes to us from two allusions which are very late, but which both rest on the second book of Papias's *Exegesis:* a fragment found in a Greek manuscript and borrowed, it would seem, from the *Christian History* of Philip of Side (written about 430, but now lost); and the other a quotation appearing in one of the manuscripts of the *Chronicle* of George the Monk, surnamed the Sinner (Hamartolus), who wrote under the Emperor Michael III 842-867).[2]

---

[1] On the meaning of ἀναιρέω, see *VGT*, pp. 33–34.

[2] The first fragment appears in the Codex Baroccianus at Oxford, and has been published by de Boor in *TU*, V, 2, 1888, p. 170. "Papias in his second Discourse says that John the Theologian and James his brother were removed by the Jews: ὅτι Ἰωάνης ὁ θεολογὸς καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθησαν". This is a summary, not a textual quotation from Papias, who surely did not describe John as "the Theologian". The second fragment is only to be found in one of the many manuscripts (Coislin. 30) of George Hamartolus (on George, see K. Krumbacher: *Geschichte der Byz. Litteratur*, 1897, p. 352 *seq.*). According to him, John, having returned from Patmos to Ephesus under Nerva (96–98), "alone of the twelve disciples remained alive, and having written his Gospel, was judged worthy of martyrdom. For Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who saw him in person (αὐτόπτης τούτου γενόμενος), says in the Second Book of his *Oracles of the Lord* that he was removed by the Jews (ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνηρέθη), thus fulfilling like his brother, the prophecy of Christ concerning them." There follows a phrase from Origen, declaring in its turn (in the *Commentary on Matthew*) that John had been a martyr, μεμαρτύρηκεν.

On the state of the text, see Zahn: *Forschungen zur Geschichte des N.T. Kanons*, Leipzig, 1900, VI, 1, pp. 147–148. Origen says in fact that the two sons of Zebedee "participated in the chalice of Christ", James by beheading, John by being sent into exile at Patmos: *Comm. in Matth.*, xvi, 6. *MG*, 13, col. 1385.

It would be necessary to have the exact tenor and the context of Papias's information, to know precisely what sense he gives to John's martyrdom, and what part in it he assigns to the Jews. But it is certain that all the ancients who read his work, not only Irenaeus, but Denis of Alexandria and Eusebius, who studied it with the object of examining the information which can be drawn from it on the question of John the Apostle and John of Ephesus, saw nothing in it which contradicted the traditional view of the martyrdom of the former. And this is also the case, though in much less interesting fashion, with George Hamartolus. We can understand, then, how so enterprising a *savant* as Mr. Percy Gardner can think " very slightly " of the testimony that can be drawn from all that in favour of the death of John, the son of Zebedee, at an " early "[1] date.

With still stronger reason must the same verdict be passed on the evidence drawn from certain ancient martyrologies. Heitmüller sums up thus the " traces " which can be found in this connection in antiquity : " the Syriac martyrology of December 27th : 'And, on the 27th, *John and James the Apostles at Jerusalem* ' ; the Carthaginian martyrology for December 27th : *VI Kal. Jan. Sancti Johannis Baptistae et Jacobi apostoli quem Herodes occidit* ' ; and finally the Armenian martyrology for December 28th : ' *Feast of the sons of thunder, James and John* ' ".[2]

Now the Syriac martyrology in question, compiled after the death of Eusebius (340), of which only one manuscript, written in 411, has come down to us, is " an abbreviation of a Greek martyrology of Asia Minor of which a more complete edition is included in the Latin compilation known as the Hieronymite Martyrology ".[3] And this is how it begins :[4]

---

[1] " The very slight testimony to the early death of John ", *JTS*, XX, 1919, p. 273.

[2] *Zur Johannes-Tradition*, in *ZNTW*, 1914, p. 190.

[3] Duchesne: *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 1889, p. 254. The question of the ancient martyrologies is there disentangled by a master hand.

[4] Critical edition of the Syriac text by R. Graffin in the *Acta Sanctorum* for November, vol. II, 1, *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* ed. by de Rossi and Duchesne, pp. lii–lxv; the text concerning Saints John and James is on p. lii.

"The names of our lords the martyrs and the days on which they have gained their crowns.

Month of Kanoun the first.

The 26th according to the Greeks: The protomartyr at Jerusalem, Stephen the Apostle, the leader of the martyrs.

And the 27th: John and James, the Apostles at Jerusalem.

And the 28th of Kanoun the first: at Rome, the City: Paul the Apostle and Simon Cephas, the leader of the Apostles of Our Lord."

To appreciate this text we have to remember that "once the feast of Christmas was fixed, there was added to it, and that very soon, various commemorations of the greatest saints of the New Testament. In his Funeral Oration for St. Basil, delivered in 379 at Caesarea in Cappadocia, St. Gregory of Nyssa said that it was the custom to celebrate after Christmas and before the first of January, the feasts of Saints Stephen, Peter, James, John and Paul".[1] There is also on this the testimony of the Syriac, Greek, Nestorian, and Armenian martyrologies. The fact brought up by the opponents of the Johannine tradition is purely and simply an application of this ancient liturgical custom. "It is certain that these anniversary dates were fixed arbitrarily, and have been supplied by no historical tradition".

The texts of Saint Gregory of Nyssa (for to that cited by Duchesne, *MG*, 46, col. 789, must be joined the no less clear one from the second panegyric on St. Stephen, *MG*, 46, col. 729 *seq.*) show no trace of the difficulties denounced by Charles

---

[1] Duchesne: *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 254 *seq.*; H. Delehaye: *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs*, pp. 115–116. James and John are ordinarily associated as brothers, and, on account of James, located at Jerusalem. Among the Nestorians, John has drawn to himself the three other evangelists. It is plain that it is useless to discuss the other testimonies brought forward by Schwartz and Heitmüller. St. John the Baptist, sometimes treated as an "apostle" (i.e. an apostolic man) often enters into this privileged circle around the Nativity of our Lord. The Armenians also place him there, by reason of his relationship with King David (his ancestor), and James the brother of the Lord!

(*The Revelation of St. John*, I, p. lvii) who seems not to have read them. That the gathering together of the witnesses to Christ around the Feast of Christmas was intentional and liturgical in origin is proved by the simple mention of James, the anniversary of whose martyrdom, according to the *Acts* themselves (xii, 1–5), fell quite close to the Feast of Easter.

### 3. THE LITERARY UNITY AND THE CHARACTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Before examining the aim pursued by the author of this Gospel, it will be convenient to discover whether we can speak of it as a literary unity. In actual fact this unity is most striking, and even those who, following Wellhausen and especially Schwartz, have questioned it, are obliged to return to it in very great measure. Thus Weiss admits it to be a primitive writing, the work of a personal disciple of Jesus, probably an inhabitant of Jerusalem, perhaps John Mark: a work which is detached, worked over and completed with the help of the Synoptic tradition by a later Asiatic disciple, speaking in the name of his group. But (and this is admirable !), since Weiss is a penetrating critic, he realises that the division he has made of the Gospel passages between the two "Johns", the author and the editor, cannot be justified by any literary reason. From end to end there is " the same type of piety, of religious experience, and of style ". He therefore concludes that the two men " keep very close to each other " and that on the whole the primitive writing and the later touches are almost indistinguishable.[1] So also Loisy, who in the first edition of his great Commentary professed the literary unity almost as a dogma (it was in fact a corollary of his entire symbolism), has in the second edition been carried along with the wind that has blown from across the Rhine. He also, accordingly, distinguishes from the primitive book a series of additions, as far as is necessary in order to eliminate all that had any historical value, beyond what has been stolen from the

---

[1] J. Weiss: *Das Urchristentum*, Göttingen, 1917, pp. 611–612.

Synoptists. But after that, he is obliged to admit " the at least apparent unity of spirit ". And he expressly admits that " the editorial work . . . has retained the manner and the mystical spirit which characterised the primitive work ", not to speak of " the mystical style " to which " later editors conformed as well as they could ".[1] Bauer, for his part, says, in the new edition of his commentary, that to him the problem does not seem to exist, and that in short " we cannot speak of the unity of St. John's Gospel except with great reserve ".[2]

For ourselves, we must boldly say that the unity of this Gospel is not contestable, if we except a few passages (the principal one, inspired but not Johannine, is the beautiful story about the adulterous woman, *Jn.* vii, 53 to viii, 11 : see below) concerning which doubts may be raised on the purely critical point of view, and on the actual order of certain passages.[3] By themselves, the author's language and style

---

[1] Loisy: *Le Quatrième Évangile*, pp. 46, 63, 65, and *passim.*

[2] Bauer: *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, Tübingen, 1925, p. 241.

[3] The at least apparent disarrangement is not contestable, and it is the only really objective contribution of the writings of Schwartz which has been the starting-point for pluralist theories: *Aporien im IV Evangel.* in the *Nachrichten der Goettinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1907, (p. 342 *seq.*) and 1908 (p. 115 *seq.*, p. 497 *seq.*). Lagrange has pointed out the chief incoherencies which a simple transposition would remedy: *Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. cxx. The most considerable of these changes (proposed by Dom Olivieri, O.S.B.) would place chapter vi before chapter v, and this would certainly give a more satisfactory sequence; but these are open questions which should be treated with infinite delicacy; it is a mistake to open the way for a host of biassed conjectures on such a matter. I dislike using this word *biassed*, which is so serious and so much abused, but here it is the right word. *Cf.* Lagrange: *RB*, 1924, pp. 321–342.

It sums up the opinion of the freest critics. For example, Streeter says in his book *The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins*, p. 377 *seq.*: " Dr. Stanton is at pains to discuss various ' partition theories ' which aim at getting behind the present text of the Fourth Gospel to earlier documents supposed to have been used by the author. I confess I think he pays them the compliment of a more serious consideration than is properly their due. Some of them are so intricate that merely to state is to refute them. For if the sources have undergone anything like the amount of amplification, excision, rearrangement and adaptation which the theory postulates, then the critic's pretence that he can unravel the process is grotesque. . . . But even the more sober seeming of these partition theories appear to me to be based on a method essentially unscientific, for three reasons. (1) The analogies and methods of O.T. criticism cannot be transferred to the New without considerable qualification. . . . (2) Exponents of source-criticism, in this and other fields, have not always, I think, sufficiently considered the psychology of authorship. . . . The fact is that the human mind is not naturally tidy. . . . (3) The only instances in this Gospel where the lack of sequence of are a convincing argument for this conclusion, not to speak of the very characteristic rhythms. No doubt there can always be supposed, in connection with the *Andromaque* of Racine or the *Faust* of Goethe, a primitive document which the author had transcribed, remodelling it here and there ; but that is a negligible conjecture, for the reasoned processes, and still more the indeliberate processes, of these excellent writers appear on each page, and almost in each line. But the originality of a style is not measured by its classical purity, and in this respect the evangelist need fear no one. In its spiritless Greek, which is without bad mistakes,[1] but is also assuredly without art, unconnected, poor in vocabulary, and monotonous in its style of development and its favourite words,[2] John has created a style which is all his own. Later Christian writers who least differ from him, such as St. Ignatius of Antioch or the author of the *Odes of Solomon*, are yet very different, and we can defy criticism to find, elsewhere than in John, half a page which can really be confounded with what he has written.

The fact is (and it is worthy of note) that it is not a question here merely of vocabulary or turns of style. The very

---

thought between one paragraph and another is in the slightest degree remarkable can be explained in a way which is far more satisfactory than the hypothesis of clumsy editing. Everyone who has ever sent a manuscript to be copied on a large scale knows that . . . sheets often get transposed, or paragraphs added by way of correction get inserted in the wrong place. The same kind of thing is frequently to be observed in ancient MSS. of classical authors (these dislocations go far beyond anything that the wildest critic has ever suggested in regard to the Fourth Gospel: *cf.* A. C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts*, p. 374 *seq.*); and there is not the slightest improbability in its having happened in one of the earliest, or even in the earliest, copy of this Gospel."

[1] On that we have a testimony which surpasses that of the safest grammarians of our time, that of St Denis of Alexandria, who says (in Eusebius, *HE*, VII, 25, 25: ed Schwartz, Eusebius of the *CB*, II, 2, p 700) that John not only wrote correctly in the Greek tongue, but with much discretion in the choice of expressions, and with style and eloquence; " so far are we from finding any barbarism or solecism in him, that we do not even find idioms " It is true that Denis is not disinterested, but the general correctness remains a fact.

[2] For example οὖν, which occurs two hundred times in this short piece of writing; much more than twice as often as in the three Synoptists put together. On the subject of Johannine language the most important works are those of Edwin A. Abbott: *Johannine Grammar*, London, 1906, and *Johannine Vocabulary*, 1905. There is a very good presentation of the matter in Lagrange: *Évangil selon saint Jean*, ci–cxx.

essence, the profundity and unity of inspiration, are above deliberate imitation, beyond the possibility of unconscious similarity. The editorial disciple of Weiss's imagination, the anonymous Ephesian and Roman scribes of Loisy, have not even the merit of probability! If we cannot write like John at will, it is chiefly because we do not think and do not feel as John thought and felt. He is different, certainly, from Paul of Tarsus, but he has an originality which is not less, and a power of penetration which sometimes carries him away. He has, moreover, self-control as a writer, a submission to the end he is pursuing, and a serene indifference to all else, which a subsequent editor could not have attained. It is by reason of that that John is a true mystic, and undoubtedly the greatest of mystics,[1] though he is far from being the richest, the most varied, the most highly talented as regards literary abilities, or the most artistic. He is this by reason of that realized unification, that consecration of the whole of his being to a single cause, to a single love, to a single faith, and finally (for all that—service, the Kingdom of God, the faith that saves, the love that beatifies, the sap that gives life—is for him as one and the same thing, Jesus) to a single Being. To no one is more completely applicable the great phrase of the mystics : *Solus Soli ;* all the rest is as nothing to him. The Master's reply to Philip's request : " Lord, show us the Father, and it is enough for us " (" Have I been so long a time with you and have you not known me ? Philip, he that seeth me seeth the Father also. How sayest thou : Shew us the Father ? Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me ? " *Jn.* xiv, 8–10), these words, which are the very definition of specifically Christian mysticism, sum up John's Gospel, and it may be said without paradox that there is in it no feature, no discourse, no development which does not lead up to that or develop from it. And that is why all the efforts at dissection, and division, are fated to remain useless exercises of critical virtuosity.

---

[1] On this point Bauer questions the attitude of Weinel: *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1921, p. 581 *seq.* He himself will only absolutely acknowledge a mystical vocabulary in John. For the rest, he objects that the doubt remains on the point of knowing how far the evangelist really lived, and experienced, what he describes: whether his religious experience extended further than conversion to Christianity, and actually reached ecstasy. John does not seem to know the vision of the Father except in the Son, he exalts the practice of the commandments as a mark of true love, etc.: *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 240. Similarly Otto (*Das Heilige*, 1926, pp. 26 and 113, note; English ed. *The Idea of the Holy*, J. W. Harvey, Oxford, 1924, pp. 22 and 88, note): "As a provisional definition of Mysticism I would suggest that, while sharing the nature of religion, it shows a preponderance of its nonrational elements and an over-stressing of them in respect to the 'over-abounding' aspect of the 'numen'. A type of religious experience acquires 'mystical colouring' if it shows an inclination to Mysticism. In this sense Christianity since St. Paul and St. John is not Mysticism, but religion with a mystical colouring." But we consider there is at the basis of these opinions too narrow and inadequate a conception of mysticism. If we reduce it to extraordinary and ecstatic religious feelings, if we abruptly place it in opposition to the religion of common practice and of authority, as a sort of religion of the Spirit, self-sufficient and impatient of every intermediary, even that of the Person of Jesus, then we must say that John is not, or is not exclusively a mystic. But in that case we deny this title to the most illustrious mystics, to Francis of Assisi, to Teresa of Avila, to Bernard of Clairvaux, all of whom found the Father in the Son, and maintained that the greatest love consists in the perfect fulfilment of the divine precepts!

In opposition to Bauer and Otto, von Hügel, in his article *John, Gospel of*, in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th Ed.), Vol. XV, pp. 453 *seq.*, maintains that John is essentially a mystic, because "there is (with John) everywhere a striving to contemplate history *sub specie aeternitatis* and to englobe the successiveness of man in the simultaneity of God." We believe there is part of the truth in that, but only part. Human history does exist for John, just as ecclesiastical institutions (as we shall see) exist. But he tends to see the former, like the latter, through the living and personal unity of Jesus, which it is the sole aim of his Gospel to inculcate.

The unity of the Gospel having been established, we have to grasp the author's aim. Did he merely wish to complete the teaching of the Synoptists, or to anticipate on certain points the incorrect conclusions which could be drawn (which were already drawn) from their text ? We do not think that John's plan can be reduced to these terms. He no doubt wished to do that, and in passing did so ; that is why the Fourth Gospel adds to our scrappy information so very little on the framework, the chronology, and the Jewish portions of our Lord's activities. But the principal aim of the author is other than this, and, as he himself said, his essential object is the planting and perfecting of faith in his readers : " But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God : and that believing, you may have life in his name " (*Jn.* xx, 31).

But what does this mean ? Have we here an apologia intended primarily for pagans ? A reading of the work is decisive against such an interpretation. Not that there are lacking in the book details capable of touching, enlightening, and stimulating the curiosity of well-disposed pagans; but the author evidently presupposes amongst his readers as a whole a preliminary initiation into Christianity, as regards both their information and their good will. It has been remarked that certain persons are introduced by John as already known, who have not previously figured in his Gospel: and also the words of Jesus are throughout reported as familiar and of value in themselves. It is a question of knowing whether, and to what extent, John made use of his predecessors, the Synoptic Evangelists. The fact of his literary dependence on the text of *Mark* seems to me to have been placed beyond dispute.[1] But the case is less clear with *Luke*, and especially with *Matthew*. But the use made by John of these texts is one thing, the knowledge that he had in common with them, though not exclusively through them of the historical tradition concerning Jesus, is quite another. For that knowledge is indubitable. And not only did John possess it, but he took it as known, in its main outlines, by those for whom his book was intended. The lessons to be found in that work are more suitable for Christians imperfectly instructed or insufficiently strengthened than for Gentiles who have still everything to learn. The impression we gather from a reading of the Gospel changes to certainty when we meet the Epistle[2] which serves as an introduction for him, and details, with greater sureness than any conjectural restoration, the errors and wanderings aimed at by the author. These victims of error, or rather these folk who are weak in faith, tempted by " antichrists ", and troubled by the " depths of Satan " (*Apoc.* ii, 24), are plainly Christians : they confess Christ, at least with their mouths, and if their profession of faith is not followed by all its logical consequences, it is sincere. Moreover, the whole object of John is to remind them of the teaching received " from the beginning ", " the ancient teaching ", which will yet come as " new " to them, since they have not hitherto penetrated its real significance.[1] He writes as to the initiated, not " as to children . . . ignorant of the truth " of the Gospel (*I Jn.* ii, 21). The important thing for them is to fortify

---

[1] Streeter: *The Four Gospels*, pp. 392–401. Compare especially *Jn.* xii, 3 and 5, with *Mk.* xiv, 3 and 5, (in which the word *πιστική* is found, and nowhere else in Greek literature so far as we know, save in allusions to this passage); *Jn.* v. 8–9; *Mk.* ii, 11–12; *Jn.* xiv, 31; *Mk.* xiv, 42, the same phrase and at the same point in the story; *Jn.* xviii, 39; *Mk.* xv, 9, etc.

[2] We might say "Epistles", for the two short letters are neither less characteristic nor, in their somewhat enigmatic brevity, less Johannine than the long Epistle (on which see Streeter, who shows very well that in order to explain the similarities between the shorter Epistles and the rest of the Johannine literature it is not sufficient to appeal to a vague "school" of which no trace remains: *The Four Gospels*, pp. 458 *seq.*) In fact, *II* and *III John* are writings which are most personal documents, giving good testimony to the man who composed them, and of recognized authority. As for the long Epistle, *I John*, Dr. Streeter excellently notes that its relations with the Gospel are so intimate and so profound (despite the great difference in the form) that we are compelled to believe it is by the same author. "And few people with any feeling for literary style or for the finer *nuances* of character and feeling, would hesitate to affirm this, but for the impli-

---

cations which seem to be involved," *loc. laud.*, p. 460. It does not suffice then to salute, with Holtzmann (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 469), in the *Prima Johannis*, the prelude and the " Perugino of the Johannine Raphael ". We must see in it the same hand and seek in it a clear avowal of the desires which led the author to compose his Gospel. A comparison of *I Jn.* ii, 22, and iv, 2, with the end of the Gospel (*Jn.* xx, 31) is conclusive in its proof: the same plan is there expressed in the same terms. If any uncertainty could remain, it would be removed by a perusal of chapter v of the Epistle, which is the very quintessence of evangelic Johannism, in its most original and most characteristic portions: he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God has overcome the world, *I Jn.* v, 5; Jesus came not only in the water of baptism, which purifies, but also in blood (redeeming and eucharistic, which purchases and nourishes). And to these two testimonies to the love of God there is to be added that of the Spirit: " And this is the testimony that God hath given to us (by these three witnesses) eternal life. And this life is in his Son: he that hath the Son hath life. He that hath not the Son hath not life " (*I Jn.* v, 11–12).

[1] ’Εντολὴ παλαιὰ · · · ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς · · · καὶ πάλιν ἐντολὴ καινή (*I Jn.* ii, 7). Elsewhere John insists that he makes no innovation, but renews " the ancient commandment which you have had from the beginning: ἀπ’ ἀρχης ". And he desires that there should remain with them the teaching " which you received by tradition from the beginning, ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ", *I Jn.* iii, 11. And again *I Jn.* ii, 24 (twice in the same verse): " the commandment which you have heard expounded from the beginning, ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς "; *Cf. Jn.* xv, 27: " You are with me from the beginning, ἀπ ἀρχῆς"; *Lk.* i, 2: " The narrative (of the life of Jesus) according as they have delivered it unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses, ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς"; *II Jn.*, 5, 6, and Westcott's note, *The Epistles of Saint John*, 1909, p. 52: " It is clear that in these passages (*I Jn* ii, 7, 24 *bis ;* iii, 11; *II Jn.* 5, 6) it cannot be a question of the first beginning of things, but of the commencement of an order of historic events in the beginning of which his readers had participated: the beginning of their Christianity, of their share in the revelation conveyed to man by Jesus Christ, the beginning of their life in union with the Father and with the Son ": (H. H. Wendt: *Der ' Anfang ' am Beginne des I Johannes Briefes* in *ZNTW*, XXI, 1922, p. 40.)

themselves in the moral purity of the Christian message, not to let themselves be seduced by those who suggest to them that faith in Christ makes them impeccable, and put the spiritual or the gnostic above the simple observance of the commandments, or even subtly distinguish between " sin " and " transgression ". For John, the transgression of a commandment is a sin, makes the transgressor a son of the devil, and causes him to lose Christ. And we are all sinners, and we remain so, although we have in Jesus a redeemer and grace which is stronger than sin and the world.[1] But above all he would have them be on their guard against antichrists ; for there are antichrists, and many of them, and amongst those who had adhered, at least temporarily, to Christ. And who are these antichrists ? Those who deny that Jesus is the Christ, or that he came in the flesh.[2] Those have not the Father who reject God's gift, the Son of God, He who is the " true God and eternal life " (*I Jn.* v, 20).

To all those who are tempted or misled by errors which seek to set the perverse instincts at liberty under colour of despising matter, to volatilize as irremediably impure the humble carnal realities which are the flower-stalk of the divine and which Jesus assumed for our salvation, to cut this off either from the ancient promises or from the divine Sonship, in order to make of it a vague entity, an ill-hypostatized Eon, neither completely human nor truly divine[3]—to all such John opposes one single argument, the primary fact, the first fundamental of the Christian faith laid down once for all men: Jesus the Messias and the Son of God, spiritual and incarnated reality, historical and eternal. Nor does the writer speak of this reality by hearsay; he does not receive his teaching at second hand; he himself " has seen him with his eyes, heard with his ears, and touched him with his hands ".[1] To all deductions, to all dreams, to all glosses, the beloved disciple opposes his own testimony, and, on top of his own, that of Jesus. And in doing this the Gentiles are not forgotten, for the only ones he takes into consideration are those who desire the light, whether they are among those of the synagogues of the Dispersion who " fear God ", or whether they gropingly carve out a lonely way through the Hellenic religions and initiations, and the schools of knowledge. If they are in good faith, they will not sin against this light, and it will be sufficient for them to be men to recognise it in the authentic words of the Word Incarnate, since he is " the true Light which enlightens all men ". The evangelic epiphany is the supernatural and gracious reply to the needs and the aspirations which stir upright souls. It is to all these seekers after God, to those who having found him still search after him, through not having understood the plenitude of the Christian message, as also to those who cry out to him without knowing him, it is to all these that the author of the Fourth Gospel addresses himself. But his horizon became enlarged after writing the Epistle, and, insensibly, the correction of errors (which had made him take up his pen) gave place, in his plan, to a more distinterested setting forth of the unsoundable riches of Christ.

---

[1] *I Jn.* i, 8; ii, 4; iii, 4–8; v, 17. This protest against perversions which were to make headway plainly in the Gnosticism of the second century has a more discreet echo in the Gospel.

[2] *I Jn.* ii, 18–22; iv, 1–4.

[3] We can call these misguided people Gnostics, it being understood that we refer to that general and early form of Gnosticism which was chiefly characterized by the sharp opposition between light and darkness, everything material or carnal being darkness, and subject in consequence to damnation, or, by a perverse consequence, to unlimited and absolute indulgence; and also characterized by the interpolation between God and mankind of spiritual powers, eons in various hierarchies, and following various systems. Attempts to name these precisely, starting from the information supplied by Irenaeus, the Nicolaitans and Cerinthus (*AH*, 1, 26, 3 and III, 11, 1; on the former, Nicolaitans or Balaamites, *Apoc.* ii, 6, 14–20, *cf.* Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, 1920, I, p. 52 *seq.* ; 63 *seq.*) have not produced decisive results. The figure of Cerinthus (G. Bardy: *Cérinthe*, in *RB*, 1921, p. 344 *seq.*) remains obscure, though the man was certainly dangerous. I would not hesitate to identify the Nicolaitans (whose name remains a puzzle)

---

with the voluptuaries denounced in *I Jn.* i, 8; ii, 4; iii, 4–8; v. 17. It seems to me that L. Venard (*Jean, saint, Doctrine générale du quatrième Évangile*, in *DTC*, VIII, 2, 1925, col. 560 *seq.*) is quite right: " Certainly one is right in thinking that the apostle intended by his teaching to forewarn his disciples against the false doctrines which were beginning to be spread abroad. He did this by no means through a systematic refutation, but by the mere exposition of a doctrine in which the Catholic faith clothed, without being altered by it, the form of an imposing religious philosophy ", *loc. laud.*, col. 561. On Cerinthus, see also Cladder: *Unsere Evangelien*, I, p. 233 *seq.*

[1] *I Jn.* i, 1–2.

His exposition of this, therefore, opens with a solemn prelude (not a prologue in heaven, like that in the Book of Job, but one before heaven and earth) in which the Word, identified with Jesus, is proclaimed God. He speaks, then, of the Word, the Logos, a term which was then as confused as it was hallowed, but considered to be the inspirer of high and noble thoughts ; the Logos, the revealer and mediator, the principle of order, of harmony and of reason, very closely allied to the divine. This notion was then wide-spread, and it is perhaps somewhat useless to inquire in what manner it can have come to the knowledge of John. As well might we ask whence might a thinker of the time of Kant have learnt to speak of reason and of lights ; or one of our own contemporaries to speak of life or of evolution. We can mention an Alexandrian influence, because in point of fact it was in Alexandria that the concept of the Logos was chiefly elaborated and magnified, but the same happened elsewhere, in the schools of philosophy and in the circles of the Stoic moralists. We must at least set aside as improbable all literary influence, such as might come from Philo or from any hermetical work that we might suppose to have existed at this period.[1]

Biblical or Rabbinical precedents may be considered, though they scarcely lead us further. The " Word of Jahveh " (*Memra Adonai*) was still perhaps in use amongst the Jews ; it was certainly in use afterwards as a respectful synonym for the Divine Name : but if we cannot refuse to this usage all influence on the choice of the word (by St. John), it had nothing to do with the genesis of the concept, for it was a true neuter.[1] Much nearer to the Johannine thought is the idea of Wisdom : St. Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had applied to Christ many of the Biblical attributes of Wisdom ; the Incarnate Jesus had even been called by St. Paul " the power of God and the wisdom of God ".[2]

---

[1] This opinion was upheld by Harnack (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1909, I, p. 109) : " Even the Logos (of John) has scarcely anything in common with that of Porticus or that of Philo, save the name "; and it now shows signs of being universally accepted among the most independent exegetes. " It is not otherwise probable that the Johannine Gospel depends on the Philonians from the literary point of view ": Loisy, (*Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 88). " We cannot safely assume that our author (John) had read the works of the Alexandrian (Philo) ": Bauer, (*Das Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 7). There follows a demonstration of the incompatibility of the attributes assigned to the Logos by the two writers.

On the Catholic side, see Lebreton: *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, 1927, pp. 636–644; Lagrange: *Evangile selon saint Jean*, p. 31 *seq*. The opposite opinion has been again upheld by Lasserre in his *Drame de la Metaphysique Chrétienne, La Jeunesse d'Ernest Renan*, II, Paris, 1925. A reply to this may be seen in *Études* of September 5, 1925, vol. CLXXXIV, p. 527–554.

Another fact, and one much less-widely known, though eminently worthy of attention, is the strict parallelism between the rôle given by John to the Incarnate Word, and that given by the most ancient Rabbis to the Torah, " who was at the beginning, who was near to God, who was divine ; by whom all was done and in whom was life ".[3]

Now all these elements could have acted, and no doubt did act, on the mind of the evangelist; but it would be a grave mistake to attribute to any one of them, or to them all as a whole, any decisive influence. Previously used, and in a context which brought it much nearer the biblical precedents,[4] this choice of designation for Jesus which opens the Gospel and gives it its proper tone is not with John the fruit of exterior inspiration or a literary reminiscence. As believers, we refer this choice to the Spirit of God ; let unbelievers speak of genius : all have to recognize in this hymn to the Word one of those inspirations in which, often after a long subconscious incubation, the thought bursts forth into full expression. It is only later that its possible adaptations and its opportuneness become manifest ; and the path which led to its formulation remains obscure.

---

[1] On *Memra* (sometimes pointed like *Adonai*), see the exhaustive dissertation in *KTM*, II, 1924, pp. 302–333. The authors conclude: " The result of our inquiry is in no doubt: the expression *Memra Adonai* became an insignificant, purely formal, synonym for the divine Tetragram; it has nothing in common with the Johannine Logos ". Moore reached the same conclusion independently: " *Memra, Meïatron* have nothing to do with the Johannine Logos " (*Intermediaries in Jewish Theology, Memra, Shekinah, Metatron*, in *Harvard Th. Review* for January, 1922).

[2] *Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία*, *I Cor.* i, 24. On the Biblical and Christian concept of Wisdom, see Lebreton: *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, pp. 122-131, 160 *seq.*, 493 *seq.* The idea of reducing the Johannine Logos to Wisdom has seduced the astonishingly ingenious but often rash mind of Rendel Harris, who thinks he can see in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel an ancient hymn to Wisdom, worked over by John! (*Athena, Sophia and the Logos*, in the *Bulletin of the J. Rylands Library*, VII, 1, Manchester, 1922, pp. 56 *seq.*) Bultmann has for his part written a small comparative romance in which, with the help of scattered features in Assyrian, Iranian, Manichaean, and Mandaean literature, he attempts to show that John's Prologue is a transposition of a baptismal hymn of Gnostic origin, the author and the period being naturally unknown, and the evangelist's part in it reduced to verses 6-8 and 15. (*Der Religiongeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-Evangelium*, in ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ . . . *H. Gunkel dargebracht*, Göttingen, 1923, pp. 1-27.) Such excesses are indeed fit to discredit any method.

[3] See the Rabbinical texts collected in *KTM*, II, pp. 353–358.

[4] The passage in the *Apocalypse* (xix, 13), which is certainly authentic despite attempts to oust it (see Allo: *L'Apocalypse*, Paris, 1921, pp. 278–280; Charles: *The Revelation of St. John*, II, p. 134), in which Christ the warrior, the conqueror, is called the Word of God, *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, if it is an anticipation well worthy of attention, yet presents itself in a very different context, and much more closely related to biblical precedents: *Wisdom*, xviii, 14–15; its basis is *Isaias*, lxiii, 1–6 (see also *Hebrews*, iv, 2), and it is without any particular doctrinal consequence.

John wished to write about Jesus, and therefore, faithful to the genealogical and theological instinct of his race, he wanted to place him, to trace him back to his origin and to God. Was he to begin as his predecessors had done with the times of Augustus and Herod ? No, he must go further back. Was he to start, then, with the era of the Prophets, the Patriarchs, the first days of the world ? Further back yet ! *Genesis* starts with : " In the beginning " . . . With that, because beyond, before that, there was only God : he must go back as far as that. " In the beginning, near to God, in God's bosom, God himself " John sees—what ? Wisdom ? the Son ? the Word ? Yes, for in him truly God has spoken ; in him, God has told us everything which he had to tell us : Jesus is the divine word, the first and the last ; He is the word of God, " the word of Jahveh on us ", He is the Word :

In the beginning was the Word,
and the Word was with God,
and he was God, the Word ;
He was from the beginning with God.

All things were by him,
And without him was nothing.
That which was in him was life,
and the life was the light of men,
and the light shines in the darkness
and the darkness did not seize it. . . .

That was the true Light
Which lights every man
coming into the world :
He was in the world,
and the world was by him,
and the world knew him not.

He came to his own,
and his own received him not.
But all those who received him,
he gave to them power to become
  children of God :
to those who believe in his name,
who, not of blood, or of will of flesh or of
  will of man, but of God, were born.

And the Word became flesh and pitched
  his tent among us,
and we contemplated his glory,
such glory as an only Son receives
  from his Father,
full of grace and of truth.[1]

---

[1] *Jn.* i, 1–5; 9–14. [For reasons which are clear from the following footnote, I have here given a literal translation, rather than the English of the Douai Version.—Tr.] It would require a lengthy note to justify the choices of textual criticism inferred here. In verses 3 and 5 I follow, despite contrary authorities and advocates (most recently, Lagrange: *Évangile selon saint Jean*, p. 6 *seq.*) the almost unanimous ancient tradition (see on the state of the text, Zahn: *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, pp. 708-711; also von Soden: *Die Schriften des N.T.*, p. 190). Lagrange admits that the most ancient evidence known for the suppression adopted by him (and by many eminent exegetes among whom may be mentioned St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and Theodoret in early times, and Schanz, Holtzmann, Zahn, Lebreton, and Vogels amongst the moderns) is Alexander of Alexandria, who wrote at the beginning of the Arian controversies (died 326, *cf. DHGE*, II, cols. 182–183). This is sufficient reason for preferring the other reading, the difficulty of which did not daunt Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Ephraem, the two Cyrils, Hilary, Ambrose and Augustine. And the fact that these retained it despite its misuse by the Arians is a sign that they held it to be certain. In truth, from the point of view of textual criticism the problem hardly exists, and the difficult reading maintained itself in the West for a very long time. St. John of the Cross, for example, seems to know no other.

As regards verse 9, we have not the manuscript or patristic state of the tradition, and moreover the third member " coming into the world " can be understood either of the light, or of men. But the first gives a more satisfactory meaning.

This expression, then, the "Word", the "Logos", John makes his own, and it is a bridge uniting the thought of his day with Christian truth. The evangelist conformed, more by instinct than by deliberate choice, to a psychological necessity. "If a new idea is announced to us for which we have no equivalent, we shall not understand it until we can set it up with the help of old ideas."[1] Hence the immense benefit[2] derived from these equivalents (otherwise hazardous or equivocal) when they become fixed in an exact and definite sense at the service of a steady conception. There is no fear of the evangelist failing in this task, and teaching the doctrine of salvation by introducing technical ideas of the Logos (in many respects uncertain, and sometimes self-contradictory) borrowed from Heraclitus or Philo, or of the Stoic or Hermetic Word. As his Master had used the general term "Kingdom of God", and the baffling expression "Son of Man", giving to each a rejuvenated or even a fresh meaning, so did the disciple mark with an indelible Christian stamp the expression which, in many various senses, was on the lips of all the sages in his time. So very far was he from seeking in their schools precise information on the person of the Incarnate Word that it is on this Person, previously and personally known, that he modelled his whole conception. And because (in spite of his care) the word *Logos* remained

---

The translation I have adopted keeps the exact appearance of the text and allows everyone to decide according to his own preference.

For the rhythm of the passage, which is incontestable and magnificent (and which is in no way broken, whatever some have said, by verses 6–8 on John the Baptist), see the very remarkable analysis by Allo: *L'Apocalypse*, p. cc.

In verse 13, the singular reading (which is without support from the Greek manuscripts, but is strongly maintained by Irenaeus and Tertullian and adopted by Zahn and Loisy), [ὃs] ἐγεννήθη, in place of οἳ ἐγεννήθησαν, gives a very beautiful meaning, applicable to the birth of Christ alone. But sound criticism must give the preference to the other, as better supported and more Johannine. Cf. *Jn.* iii, 3 *seq.*; *I Jn.* ii, 29; iii, 9; iv, 7; v, 4, 18. But it should be noted that by the hypothesis of an Aramaic original "the variant ὃs ἐγεννήθη becomes considerably more plausible": Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 34–35.

[1] E. Baudin: *Leçons de Psychologie*, Paris, 1919, p. 456.

[2] It seems to me that it is in this sense that we must understand the (to my taste somewhat exaggerated) expressions of Rousselot, in the noble passage of *Christus* on the Logos of John: ed. of 1921, pp. 1018–1020.

capable of bearing deficient and erroneous interpretations, he replaced it in the remainder of his Gospel by the less equivocal expressions of *light*, *truth*, and *life*.

These expressions, which might warn us not to cut off our author from the thought of his age, do not necessarily lead us to Alexandria. Life and death, light and darkness, wisdom and folly, falsehood and truth, appearance and reality, spirit and flesh : all these antitheses formulate elementary oppositions which have been perceived as long as there have been thinking men. But furthermore the Old Testament had prefigured in the visits made to man by the Wisdom of God, the final advance described in the Johannine Prologue.[1] And, outside the inspired Scripture there is to be found in the Palestinian *Book of Henoch* a most striking analogous passage :

> Wisdom found not a place wherein she could dwell,
> And a dwelling was assigned to her in heaven :
> Wisdom went out to dwell amongst the children of men,
> And she found no habitation.
> Wisdom returned to her home,
> And took her place amongst the Angels.[2]

John took up again and corrected the old Pharisee's melancholy parable : instead of reascending to heaven, a dove to whom an inhospitable world offered no place of rest, the Divine Logos, he who is the true Wisdom, has remained among us, despite the hostile reception given him by his own, and has pitched his tent in our desert, which his grace will make fruitful.

These words and these images, which are so thoroughly in accord with Jewish tradition, were undoubtedly used by our

---

[1] *Job*, xxviii, 12–14, 21, 23; *Baruch*, iii, 9 *seq.; Ecclus.* xxiv, 5 *seq.; Prov.* i, 20 *seq.;* viii, 1 *seq.;* ix, 1 *seq.; Wisdom* vii, 7 *seq.;* and see also Lebreton's commentary, *Origines*, pp. 122–131, 160–161.

[2] *Book of Henoch* xlii, 1–2; in Martin, pp. 90, 91 ; Charles, in *APOT*, II, p. 213.

Lord also, and the Synoptists offer us many examples of them, and St. Paul besides. But in St. John's Gospel they are present everywhere like a sort of atmosphere. No doubt that is due to the choice made by St. John of the lessons which he wished to have preserved, but it is also accounted for by the fact that he reported the Saviour's teaching in the terms which were most likely to be understood by his hearers or readers. To men who might be misled, and who would certainly be tempted, by the dualist notions which came, perhaps, from Iran, and were in any case very widespread since they are to be found at the base of all the forms of Gnosticism, and later of Manichaeism—to such men it was important to recall, in their own language, that Christ is the light, the truth, and the life.

*Light*, in the spiritual and religious world, is that gift which enables a man to perceive the road which leads to the Father. More generally, it is the joy and the sunshine of the soul ; it purifies the soul and makes it disinterested, noble, and splendid. The daughter of heaven, it comes from on high and opposes all that is low, all that is vile, egoistic, ugly and deformed, it fights against darkness, and especially against what is worst of all, the darkness of voluntary blindness. It reveals and gladdens ; it discerns and judges : and the good, capable of sustaining its steady illumination, love it ; while evil-doers, whom it condemns, flee and abhor it.

*Truth* (in contrast with the specious, the shadows, the figure, the appearance, the lie) is that which constitutes the real, the solid and the efficacious in a moral and religious agent—whether it is a question of a person or of a thing. Unlike the unsubstantial food of vain imaginations, the true bread feeds and satisfies the soul. The true vine, unlike the vine-branches full of leaves and tendrils which deceive the pilgrim on his journey, bears luscious and enduring fruits. The true witness is he who speaks of what he has seen, heard, and touched, of what he knows at first hand.

The true water is the living water which has all the properties of gushing out, of freshness, and of limpidity ; which is neither exhausted nor corrupted as is that of a trough or of a cistern. In a word, it lives.

*Life* is the fundamental attribute[1] which makes all the others possible and for which nothing else can do duty. It is the interior principle of all action, in the order of souls as in that of bodies. As such, it is susceptible of more and of less, and of successive expansions, passing from the simple animal and human life to a superior and spiritual life, itself the outline and source of a godlike, stable and blessed life, the life of eternity.

Now this life, which the Jews[2] expected from their legal justice, under the sign of Moses, Jesus, in whom it originates and who possesses it in all fullness, brings with his grace, giving in reality this spiritual and supreme good to him who pleases him and does not make himself unworthy.

> For of his fullness we have all received,
> And grace after grace,
> For the Law was given by Moses,
> Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Frey, in *Biblica*, I, 1920, pp. 37 *seq.;* pp. 211 *seq.* *Le concept de Vie dans l'Evangile de saint Jean.*

[2] We know that by this expression John habitually designates either the mass of the Jewish people, living in Palestine and conforming to the Law, or (and this more frequently) the leaders, the heads of the opposition to his preaching. See Drummond: *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, London, 1903, pp. 409 *seq.*, 416–417; Belser: *Der Ausdruck* Ἰουδαῖοι *im Joh. evangelium*, in the *Tübingen Quartalschrift* for 1902, pp. 168–222; and above all W. Lutgert: *Die Juden im Johannesevangelium*, in *N.T. Studien . . . G. Heinrici dargebracht*, Leipzig, 1914, p. 153 *seq.:* "This mode of expression is not unusual. We do not express ourselves otherwise in like cases . . . in a country of mixed population. For example, at Posen one speaks of Poles and of Germans absolutely as the evangelist speaks of Jews. We speak readily of the attitude of an official towards the Germans, although he himself is a German".

[3] *Jn.* i, 16, 17. As regards the translation of ἀντί in verse 16, I follow, without enthusiasm, Lagrange (*Evangile selon saint Jean*, p. 25). We could also say "grace upon grace", in a better, "true" order, which is totally opposed to the legal, figurative order. The ingenious and original explanation of d'Alès (*RSR*, IX, 1919, p. 384 *seq.*): "grace (of the Spirit) for grace (of the Word)", cf. *Jn.* xvi, 13–15, is defensible, and better preserves the ordinary value of ἀντί, on which Moulton and Milligan note (*VGT*, I, 46–47): "by far the commonest meaning of ἀντι [in κοινή Greek] is the simple *instead of*". See also Bover: *Biblica*, VI, 1925, pp. 454–460.

## 4. THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Such is the background, and such the atmosphere of the Johannine landscape. It is of a spiritual nature, certainly, but it is also an objective description, for the author's concern was not to delight but to guide to an end. What was he to preserve among the innumerable riches (signs and discourses) which his memories suggested, and of which his disciples were to say with naive complacency that " if they were written every one, the world itself would not be able to contain the books that should be written " (*Jn.* xxi, 25) ?

It is difficult to give a concise idea of the book, because it felt the effects of the conditions of an oral method of teaching which was bound to be very lengthy. Inasmuch as certain parts (some of the most considerable) have been elaborated in their detail, the general plan of the work is difficult to define. Some have adopted as the main theme of the book the career of the Light which came into the world : his heavenly origin, his successive manifestations, the varying receptions he encountered from believers, from the indifferent, and from enemies ; finally his last earthly irradiations and the maintenance of his life-giving light in a world which passes judgment on itself by the judgment it passed on him. In such views there is a great part of the truth (which might be worked over again by starting from the idea of the Life) ; but while they represent sufficiently accurately what John did, they might impoverish his Gospel by confining it within too simplified a plan.

And we call it his " Gospel ", because the book, which has sometimes been considered a collection of elevated considerations on the mysteries of Christ, or even castles in the air consisting of subtly-woven symbols, is in reality a presentation of Jesus's message, one of the forms of the Good News.

It is true that it is different to those which preceded it, but it is closely related to them by the care taken to make the Master known, in order that its readers may be made to believe in him. We must also reject straight away theories which represent as foreign to the author any intention of imparting historical value to whatever in his work appears as history (and that is almost the whole work). But in truth, this unreceptive attitude is becoming less and less defended; it is indeed indefensible. It is unanimously recognised that the author (or the responsible editors) of the Johannine Gospel professes to be a witness of what he relates and wishes his readers to believe that it has actually happened,[1] and to believe it on his word. A study of John's style in no way weakens the inference drawn concerning his object. This style, as a critic of the extreme left (but one who is free from the symbolism of recent years) lately noted, is "remarkably concrete".[2] It is in fact the Johannine paradox that this unyielding realism unites with the spiritual elevation of his plan.

---

[1] Alexandrian allegorism cannot be alleged here. Even the boldest of the ancient Fathers, Origen, himself taught that in the Scriptures the absence of the "corporal" sense is very rare (this must not be confused with the literal sense, but is a variety of it: that in which "the literal meaning is expressed in proper terms, without metaphors or figures"), and that it must not be presumed except when all means have been exhausted of finding one which is not absurd or unworthy of God. This is obviously not the case here. See the complete texts commented upon in the dissertation by Prat: *Principes d'exégèse*, in *Origène*, Paris, 1907, pp. 114–140. And let us see what the most "Johannine" of John's commentators, St. Augustine, has to say of it:

"Before all things, my brethren, we warn you with all our power, and we order you, that when you propose to expound the profound meaning of the facts narrated in the Scriptures, you first of all believe that what you read of actually happened in the way in which it is reported, lest, for want of having the actual fact for foundation, you seek to build at random": *Sermon* II, n. 7; *ML*, XXXVIII, 30.

[2] K. L. Schmidt: *Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte*, in ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ . . ., II, p. 132: "*Merkwürdig Konkret!*" In the same sense, Burkitt: "In no early Christian document is the real humanity of Jesus so emphasized as in the Fourth Gospel": *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 232, 233; and Holtzmann: "What we read in *Hebrews*, v. 7, of the days of the flesh during which Christ had to live the life of a man and to have human feelings, is absolutely true of the Incarnate Word of John. He is hungry (iv, 8 and 31) and thirsty (iv, 7 and 9); he is tired with the journey (iv, 6). His human soul never entirely sinks in the sea of the conception of the Word. And it is not merely the surface of this sea which is gently agitated by the sensible movements of his heart, and its tempests, xi, 32 and 38; but he feels to the extent of tears (xi, 35), and to an anguish before death which astonishes himself (xii, 27). The only defence against these arguments has been that of lightly skipping over them": *Lehrbuch der N.T. Theologie*, pp. 462–463.

Another fact, less often remarked because it is less apparent, but yet very certain, and not less important for a sane understanding of the work, is the part given by John to the institution of the Eucharist and the sacraments. If he does not trace the origin of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, which every Christian and every serious aspirant to Christianity already knew, he gives a very considerable place to their spiritual and saving value. He affirms their necessity and insistently excludes every interpretation which would alter their visible and true character (i.e., as efficacious and real), and would transform them into mere symbols. Particularly is this plain as regards the Holy Eucharist, in which the reality of the Body and the Blood, which is solemnly affirmed, is maintained despite divisions and defections amongst Christ's followers.

> Amen, amen, I say unto you :
> Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of man
> and drink his Blood,
> you shall not have life in you . . .
> For my Flesh is meat indeed :
> and my Blood is drink indeed.
> He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood
> abideth in me : and I in him.
> *Jn.* vi, 53-56.

The same is true of ecclesiastical unity and submission to lawful pastors, which is made a condition of any share in eternal life (*Jn.* xx, xxiii).

The objections made to the historical value of *John* on the score of alleged incompatibility with the Synoptists, which were long looked upon as formidable difficulties, have been little by little demolished by a more objective study. The less prejudiced critics acknowledge that the distance separating the Fourth Gospel from the other three has been greatly exaggerated. To say, with Loisy, in his second Commentary, that " as regards the narrative matter the principal object of the editorial work was to make the mystical Gospel acceptable by bringing it as much as possible into accord with the more or less floating tradition which had crystallized in the Synoptists ",[1] is to admit, with bad grace, that the two traditions are closely akin. In reality, they differ chiefly as explicit and implicit, *John* being like a constant light, disclosing permanently the lines of a monument, which the words reported by the Synoptists no more than illuminate for an instant, like a flash. Bultmann somewhere calls *Mark* (which, like all the liberal critics, he considers the most ancient and the best founded on history) " the book of secret epiphanies "[2]; and Wendland had previously said: " Jesus is, in *Mark*, from his first entry on the scene, illuminated with all the splendour of the divine with which the apostolic faith in the Christ had invested him ".[3]

J. Weiss, for his part, has said:

> Mark's work contains not only an outline of the teaching of Jesus, but also the annunciation of the Person of Jesus Christ, the Son of God . . . What Mark says in regard to the Transfiguration (ix, 3-7) should be read in the sense intended by the author, almost as John expressed it (*Jn.* i, 4): *they beheld his glory*, habitually hidden but then for a moment revealed. When Jesus healed leprosy, blindness, and all kinds of sickness, when he exercised his empire over the devils, the tempest, and even death itself, he was truly (as the devils confessed) the " Holy One of God ", the " Son of the Most High ". Moreover, quite naturally, it goes without saying, for Mark, that Jesus knew everything in advance and exactly: his passion, death, and resurrection, the treachery of Judas, and Peter's denial. In this respect his picture of Jesus does not differ from that of John.[4]

---

[1] *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 63. See also: *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, 1922, p. 630.

[2] *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, p. 227. The expression is attributed to Dibelius by Loisy: *Evangile selon Luc*, p. 23.

[3] *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, Tübingen, 1912, p. 267.

[4] *Das Urchristentum*, p. 540.

And positively the historical nature of John's work is made clear by the soundness and exactitude of his historical and geographical touches. The evidence of the facts confines the most emancipated of the critics " to the neighbourhood of Palestine ", where the author's attitude to the Jews and the " Jewish tone " of his language explain themselves.[1] And if it was a case of a classical writer the reaction would be prompter and more complete. For a long time past there has been recognised what Schmiedel calls " the geographical and historical correctness " of the evangelist ; and Renan ends a detailed analysis (in which our modern rationalists could find much to learn) by a series of conclusions, of which the first is that " considered in itself, the account of the material circumstances of the life of Jesus as supplied in the Fourth Gospel is superior by its probability to the Synoptic narratives ".[2] We do not ask as much as that ; but there must be accorded to the Johannine account a value which can scarcely be cheapened in favour of the Synoptists.

Let us confine ourselves to one detail, which is very striking, and is of indisputable objectivity. Over and above the proper names of places given in all the Gospels, and forming the common property of the Christian tradition, each evangelist contributes his sheaf of original topographical indications : now John gives more of these by himself alone than the three others[3] put together, and of all those which it has been possible " to test on the spot, none has been found erroneous. By far the greater number are easily verified, and this number steadily grows with the progress of research work in Palestine. The author, then, was Palestinian ; but, more than this, he presents himself as an eye-witness, and we declare that he is indeed a reliable eye-witness ".[1]

---

[1] Bauer: *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 237. Bauer imagines Antioch to have been the place of origin; and Loisy, who holds out for " the Ephesian mystic ", would be inclined to make it come " perhaps from Syria ": *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, p. 629. Cf. Schmiedel: *John, son of Zebedee*, in Cheyne's *EB*, II, col. 2542.

[2] *Vie de Jésus*, Appendix, pp. 477–536 (13th ed.). See in the same sense Lepin : *La valeur historique du Quatrième Evangile*, in which the question is studied very soundly, and also *DAFC*, I, col. 1309.

[3] There are twenty-four entirely fresh ones in John, of which nineteen are of countries and places, while Matthew has only five (of which three are general), Mark three, and Luke seven; fifteen in all the Synoptists. See the very clear and detailed lists drawn up by that most experienced Palestinian scholar Lagrange (who has lived for thirty years in the Holy Land) : *Evangile selon saint Jean*, pp. cxxi–cxxvi. The author concludes with remarks on " the evidence of the topographical accuracy of John ".

As regards his " historical correctness ", this is made clear by his mention of a number of peculiar circumstances which are without apparent significance, but which throw a particular light on what we know from other sources of the life of Christ. Here is an example, described by Renan as " a little historical treasure " :

> *After these things, Jesus walked*[2] *in Galilee : for he would not walk in Judea because the Jews sought to kill him. Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand. And his brethren said to him : Pass from hence and go into Judea, that thy disciples also may see thy works which thou dost. For there is no man that doth anything in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, manifest thyself to the world. For neither did his brethren believe in him. Then Jesus said to them : My time is not yet come ; but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you : but me it hateth, because I give testimony of it, that the works thereof are evil. Go you up to this festival day : but I go not yet up to this festival day, because my time is not accomplished. When he had said these things, he himself stayed in Galilee. But after his brethren were gone up, then he also went up to the feast, not openly, but as it were, in secret. The Jews therefore sought him on the festival day and said : Where is he ? And there was much murmuring among the multitude concerning him. For some said : He is a good man. And others said : No, but he seduceth the people. Yet no man spoke openly of him, for fear of the Jews.* (*Jn.* vii, 1-13).
>
> The dissembled ill-will of Jesus's brothers,[3] and the precautions which he was obliged to take, are [observes Renan] expressed with admirable artlessness. It is here that the symbolic and dogmatic explanation completely

---

[1] Lagrange, *loc. laud.*, pp. cxxv, and cxxvii.
[2] In the French: " again made his round (of preaching) ".—[Tr.]
[3] On the " brothers of Jesus ", Vol. II, Book III, Ch. I, 2.

breaks down. What dogmatic or symbolic intention can be found in this short passage, which is more likely to be the source of objections than to serve Christian apologetical ends? . . . No, no, here we can boldly say: *Scribitur ad narrandum.*[1]

And such examples could be multiplied. Nothing is more precious than the Johannine accounts of the activity of Jesus at Jerusalem, for explaining and justifying those words to be found in the Synoptists (belonging undoubtedly to what Liberals call the Collection of Discourses, and which constitutes, according to them, the most solid portion of our information on Jesus's doctrine): "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee (by God), how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldest not!"[2] "The Fourth Gospel alone enables us to give full weight to these words, and if it did not exist, it would, on this point, be necessary to invent it."[3] But, as Loofs remarks in this connection,[4] many critics are blinded by their prejudices: "It is evident that the purely human conception of Jesus forces its supporters to declare that the Fourth Gospel does not come from John; moreover, that it is not worthy of belief. But by doing so it proves itself, from a really historical point of view, unable to do full justice to the sources."

And more than this: this writing, which opens with the solemn Prologue quoted above, in which the Word is hailed as God, and which therefore presents itself, with premeditated design, as without perspective in what concerns the supreme dignity of the Messias, reveals to an attentive examination the most characteristic features of the Gospel history. The economy of the manifestation of Jesus is shown in the beginnings, the lapses, and the progress of the faith of the disciples in their Master.[1] And the same may be said of the human limitations of the Saviour,[2] of the bitter opposition which he encountered, and of the unusual sharpness of the hatreds which his preaching aroused. These are historical touches which are unexpected, and which seem at first sight foreign, or even contrary, to the writer's avowed end.

---

[1] *Vie de Jésus*, Appendix, pp. 499–500 (13th Ed.).

[2] *Mt.* xxiii, 37; *Lk.* xiii, 34.

[3] Moffatt: *An Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.*, p. 541 *seq.*

[4] Loofs: *What is the truth about Jesus Christ?* Edinburgh, 1913, p. 100. The German edition is later.

More delicate to handle, but not less important, is the information to be drawn from the language and the mental habits of the author: it is a Jew who thought out, wrote down, and balanced the Gospel. Recent attempts, made by men who are admittedly competent,[3] have not, in our opinion, succeeded in showing that the work is a translation from an Aramaic original: the relative correctness of the text and especially the use of current Hellenic expressions many of which are almost technical, seem to make the opposite opinion more probable. But it remains indisputable that, even if he wrote in Greek, John retained the ways of feeling and of writing proper to the Jews, just as Rabindranath Tagore, when he writes in English (and absolutely correctly), shows himself an Indian and a Bengali (or, to take a closer example, as the novelist Joseph Conrad " remains Polish through his inner sentiment ", although he wrote directly in English and " his vocabulary had all the concrete richness of an Anglo-Saxon basis ", sometimes even superior to that of Rudyard Kipling).[1] Even so, in due proportion, our evangelist remained Jewish by " his inner sentiment ", and he shows it the more in that his work was composed in an oral style, as is revealed by the numerous rhythmic repetitions that have been extracted from it.

---

[1] See below, Vol. II, Book III, Ch. II, 2.

[2] *Jn.* xii, 20–28; xiv, 28: " The Father is greater than I " etc. On the text see Vol. II, Book IV, Ch. II, footnote.

[3] Lattey: *The Semitisms of the Fourth Gospel*, in *JTS*, 1919, pp. 330–336; and especially Burney: *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, an essential work. Torrey, another distinguished Aramaic scholar, while disputing many of Burney's conclusions, equally supports the Aramaic origin of the Gospel: *The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John* in *Harvard T.R.*, October, 1923. Mr. Albright, *ibid.*, April, 1924, thinks that the author himself must have made two editions, the first Aramaic, and the second Greek.

Without going so far as to adopt the hypothesis of an Aramaic original, we can say that all competent scholars are now agreed in acknowledging the very marked Jewish tinge of the language of the Fourth Gospel. As regards vocabulary, John, with Mark, uses the most numerous Hebrew or Aramaic words, which he sometimes explains, but not always (see the list in Lagrange s *Evangile selon saint Jean*, p. cxvi). He habitually employs antithetical parallelism to develop his thought, and most frequently without marking the contrast by the play of Greek particles. Above all, with very few exceptions he does not join up his phrases, but juxtaposes them in the Aramaic fashion. This is all pointed out by Burney: *The Aramaic Origin*, etc., chapter II, pp. 49–56. " By every hypothesis ", remarks Lagrange, *loc. laud.*, p. civ, " we must recognise in that a habit borrowed from Aramaic practice ". As regards the formal use of *I*, which has always a solemn meaning, Bauer observes for his part: " There is no doubt that we have to do with non-hellenic, oriental formulas ": *Der feierliche Ich Stil* in *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, pp. 114–115.

But perhaps the ways of thinking and arguing peculiar to Rabbinical Judaism are even more marked in it ; nor is the same technical initiation necessary for perceiving them. Holtzmann some time ago noted that " his thought (the Christ as he is presented to us by John) moves in the logical order of the Rabbinical *Middoth* (viii, 47 ; x, 28, 29) : from like to like (iii, 6) ; from highest to lowest (viii, 46) ; from the smallest to the greatest (vii, 24) ".[2] And the testimony of contemporary Jewish scholars who have studied the Gospel is unanimous. One of the most eminent of them, Abrahams, expresses himself thus : " Dr. Gudemann, Dr. Buchler, Dr. Schechter, Dr. Chwolsohn, Dr. Marmorstein have all shown that the Talmud makes credible details which many Christian expositors have been rather inclined to dispute. Most remarkable of all has been the cumulative strength of the arguments adduced by Jewish writers favourable to the authenticity of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, especially in relation to the circumstances under which they are reported to have been spoken ".[3] And it is of no use to quote in opposition to this Renan's declaration : " the Fourth Gospel is the least

---

[1] E. Legouis and L. Cazamian *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise,* Paris, 1924, p. 1254. (English edition published by Dent, 1930.)

[2] *Lehrbuch der N.T. Theologie*, p. 463. These confirmations are the more convincing in that Holtzmann was more inclined, by the spirit of his time and of his school, to stress the influence of Hellenism in the Fourth Gospel.

[3] *Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis*, in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 181. The result of these works and of their progress is recorded in *KTM*, II, pp. 303–588. Previously A. Schlatter: *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten,* 1902, had recorded many of these details.

Jewish of the New Testament writings".[1] A defensible meaning for this can only be maintained by explaining it with the words of Jülicher, according to whom this Gospel is "the most anti-Jewish (book) in the New Testament".[2] But it is no doubt better to say that Renan (more excusable fifty years ago than he would be now) was deceived, for Jülicher's phrase is itself excessive.[3] In reality, John's position in regard to his race and to his people is similar in many respects to that of St. Paul. Like Paul, and with equal clearness, he claims for Israel the privilege of being the intermediary between God and humanity: "Salvation comes from the Jews", and "we also adore that which we know".[4] But above all the essential sanctions invoked by the author are the very same as those in which Israel put its confidence: the Scripture which "cannot be broken".[5] Moses "who wrote of Christ",[6] Abraham, the father of all believers, who rejoiced to contemplate in anticipation the days of Christ;[7] the prophets who announced the great outpouring of the Spirit; and the true believers greeting Jesus with the traditional titles:

> Hosannah!
> Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord,
> and the King of Israel![8]

One of the persecutions to be inflicted on the first disciples will be that of chasing them from the synagogues: they will not go of themselves.[1] Like his three predecessors, John transcribed the inscription on the cross, but he did it more completely, mentioning the detail that it was written in three languages ; it ran :[2]

---

[1] *L'Antéchrist*, p. xxv.

[2] *Einleitung in das N.T.*, p. 321.

[3] Bauer, *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 237, holds to this opinion, and from it concludes in favour of a proximity to Palestine for the origin of the book: "Anti-semitism of this virulence places us in a region in which the Jews could not only make life hard for the Christians, but also place their lives seriously in danger".

[6] *Jn.* iv, 22. That the "we" might here be said by Jesus in the name of the Jews clearly follows from the context, *Jn.* iv, 9; and that is decisive, as Holtzmann has remarked: *Lehrbuch der N.T. Theologie*, II, p. 397; *cf.* St. Paul, *Romans*, iii, 1–5; ix, 1–6, etc.

[4] *Jn.*. xv, 35.

[5] *Jn.* i, 45; v, 46; vii, 19.

[6] *Jn.* viii, 31–56.

[7] *Jn.* vi, 45.

[8] *Jn.* xii, 13.

JESUS OF NAZARETH
THE KING OF THE JEWS

On every page the reader's attention is drawn to the fulfilment of the prophecies.[3] Finally, John finds it natural that the high priest, despite his personal unworthiness, should in his public capacity display the spirit of prophecy.[4] And to these indications, which are supported by the whole Gospel, the upholders of Johannine antisemitism can only oppose the Master's saying about the false shepherds who preceded him, and the usual and generally (though not always) derogatory appellation of "Jews". This all-embracing name, which avoids all distinctions of parties which are less clear to an audience composed of Gentiles, is very natural and has analogies in all countries where two civilisations, two languages, and two conceptions of life are not only juxtaposed, but entangled, and sometimes come in conflict like ancient and European culture in India.

As regards the saying of Jesus : "Amen, amen, I say to you, I am the door of the sheep. All others, as many as have come (before me) are thieves and robbers : and the sheep heard them not. I am the door"—its literal exegesis is difficult, and the state of the text is of itself evidence of this.[5] All are agreed on the fact that neither Moses nor the prophets of the old dispensation (including the last and the greatest of them, John the Baptist) are here referred to ; but agreement comes to an end with the phrase " thieves and robbers ". Many, following St. John Chrysostom, think that the reference is to " false Messiahs ", such as Judas the Galilean,[1] and no doubt there must be included in the condemnation all those who, through personal ambition or rigid nationalism, falsified the notes of the Kingdom of God. The result of such efforts, self-seeking or violent, is shown in the following verse to be ruin and death ; whereas the Good Shepherd has come to give men, his flock, life and in greater abundance.

---

[1] *Jn.* xvi, 2.

[2] *Jn.* xix, 19–20.

[3] *Jn.* xii, 38 *sq.*; xiii, 18; xv, 25; xvii, 12; xix, 23–24, 28, 29, 36, 37.

[4] *Jn.* xi, 51.

[5] *Jn.* x, 7–8. The words "before me", πρὸ ἐμοῦ are lacking in many Greek uncials and cursives. What is more serious, they are not to be found either in the Old Latin or the Vulgate, or in the Syriac or the Coptic (Sahidic) editions. But we retain them here, as the *lectio difficilior*, together with the great majority of editors of the Greek text. D suppresses "all, πάντες" at the beginning of the verse.

This reference, and the grieved or pathetic[2] verification of the faithlessness of many Israelites, and especially of the majority of the leaders, is in no way definitely antisemitic, still less (as has actually been maintained) the work of a man of Greek origin. The most elementary psychology shows the contrary : it is precisely thus (with all the differences entailed by diversity of period and of manners of speaking) that an ardent convert judges those of his brethren who through obstinacy have not followed him into the home of light. A stranger better realises their misfortune, and sometimes estimates their perversity less severely.

## CONCLUSION

The ancient tradition which attributes the Fourth Gospel and all the Johannine works to John the son of Zebedee, if it leaves certain problems[3] which cannot be solved merely by the resources of criticism in the present state of our knowledge, is none the less the solution which is most solidly supported and is the most probable. We believe there is no need to revert to the alleged incompatibilities which have too long been the butt of polemics. The date at which the Gospel was put into writing (the last years of the first century) marks the end of a long period of elaboration, not of the (truly improbable) improvisation of an old grey-beard. That the apostle, in his old age, should have found the strength and the initiative for finally setting in fixed form his teaching which had so long subsisted orally after the Hebrew manner—that is quite plausible, and many examples nearer our own time make this achievement credible.[1] We need not suppose that the beloved disciple was isolated or deprived of filial help from the disciples whom he had trained. For if the very marked personality visible in the style scarcely allows us to suppose a Mark at the right hand of this second Peter, it by no means excludes the services of a secretary, or rather of several faithful followers amongst whom were perhaps Aristion and John the Elder, who wrote at the dictation of the old master, and under his revision, before affirming at the end of the work its apostolic origin and its truth.

---

[1] So says Lagrange: *Evangile selon saint Jean*, pp. 277–278: the rejection of the reading πρὸ ἐμοῦ, clearly makes this sense more flowing. So also Bauer: *Das Joh. Evangelium* (2nd ed.) p. 135; and Loisy: *Le Quatrième Évangile*, (2nd ed.) pp. 322–323, who adds the incredulous leaders of Judaism; also Knabenbauer: *Commentarius in Johannem*, p. 327–328; and Belser: *Das Evang. des Heiligen Johannes*, 1905, pp. 320–321, who understands the passage only of the Pharisees, where I should see rather the " hirelings " of verses 12–13.

[2] *Jn.* xii, 36*b*–46.

[3] Of these problems, one of the most delicate is that of the identity between the Seer of the Apocalypse and the Evangelist. I explain in a separate note why we admit this identity, so as not to complicate unnecessarily a statement already diffuse; see below, note I, *The Apocalypse of John the Seer and the Gospel of John the Disciple*, p. 237.

Even less weight has the objection which denies to the "Galilean fisherman" the culture evinced by the Gospel. This objection is based on a quite unjustifiable assimilation of our modern society to the social and religious condition of the Israelites of the first century. With us the superiority of a classical education and the institution of the liberal professions have given rise to the idea that a man of the people could only very exceptionally raise himself to a literary level.

---

[1] It is interesting to note that the length of time which separated the drawing up of this Gospel from the events which it describes is almost the same as that which elapsed between the first crusade of St. Louis, 1248, and the time when de Joinville wrote his very vivacious account of it, about 1305–1314.

Nearer our own time, the most powerful social works of Pope Leo XIII, who was born in 1810, were undertaken between his 81st and 91st years: 1891, the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum;* 1901, the Encyclical *Graves de Communi.*

Finally, Zahn's commentary on the *Apocalypse*, so often quoted in these pages, is dated 1924, the author being 86 (for he was born on October 10th, 1838).

But it would be a grave mistake to transport these social ideas into ancient Palestine. Just as the greater number of the Doctors (e.g. St. Paul) had learned and practised a trade which protected them from want, so also many of the rich and powerful, even priests, were considered as rustics, peasants, and people without real culture.[1] For this, based chiefly on the Bible, demanded not so much technical training as application, recollection, and piety. If legalism had become, and especially if it was going to become, a complicated and bristling science, a real knowledge of the Law and the Prophets was the possession of all Israelites who delighted in it. A man from the common people, such as Aqiba, could raise himself to be a master and the leader of a school : a peasant, a fisherman having only the instruction he had received round the family hearth and later at the elementary school attached to every synagogue, not only knew how to read, write, and count, but, with the help of Hebrew which was taught him that he might understand the letter of the Scriptures, benefited as much from this as could a Christian child from the study of liturgical Latin. And this instruction, which revolved around the Bible, powerfully developed the religious sense : the Psalms, many of which were learnt by heart, the rhythmical recitation of the most noble passages of the Law and the Prophets, and the service of the synagogues, all helped to complete the work in the case of the more talented.[2]

We cannot find corresponding examples in our secularized and differentiated society, but rather in social groups such as the parish in the old districts of French Canada, or in Mussulman or Hindu centres, where religious training is essential and truly the frame upon which the whole intellectual life is stretched. And had St. Francis of Assisi, who was without technical training but yearned after the perfect life, had he more than this ?[1]

---

[1] Cf. G. Foot Moore: *The Am-Ha-ares and the Haberim* in *Beginnings of Christianity*, I, London, 1920, pp. 441–442: " The *am-ha-ares* was not necessarily of the lowest social class. . . . The line between the two classes was, thus, not one of birth or station but, we might say, of culture and piety, and there was no great gulf fixed so that men could not pass over from one side to the other."

[2] See Edersheim, *La Société juive à l'époque de Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1896, ch. VII [there is an English edition, London, 1876.—Tr.]; also G. Farmer, *Boyhood*, and David Smith, *Education*, in *DCG*, I, pp. 222 *sqq.*, 507 *sqq.*; *Education* in *JE*, V, p. 42. On the social state of the Galilean peasants, very interesting details are given by Schwalm: *La vie privée du Peuple Juif à l'époque de Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1910, pp. 89 *sqq.*, 103 *sqq.*, 169 *sqq.*

Full of ardour and of faith, a young man,[2] a "son of thunder", placed himself first in the school of John the Baptist, and then in that of Jesus, and under this guidance acquired much more understanding than he had at first possessed.[3] And having become in his maturity a leader of men, in constant touch with Jerusalem at first, and then with Samaria, and later with Syria and Asia (Antioch, perhaps ; almost certainly Ephesus), with Judaising Christians, with Christians recruited from the Synagogues of the Dispersion, Christians hailing from the Gentiles, and with pagans ; and being forced to instruct, to govern the Churches, and to defend them against the invasions of gross or subtle errors, the Apostle, the prophet, finally established himself in the rôle of doctor. And his authority, which had always been considerable, became greater as his old colleagues were in turn called to render testimony to Christ [with their blood] ; so that, when he alone was left, he was compelled to put his Gospel into writing. We cannot hesitate to say that this extraordinary little book is better explained as having been dictated by this man than by any of the hypotheses that some have substituted for the traditional view.

And are there not many features in it which are just those which we might expect from an important and independent witness, a disciple and a friend of Jesus : especially its elevation and singular fundamental originality, despite its more or less verbal contact with the philosophical thought of the day ; so, too, the irreducible semitism of the thought flowing in channels which hellenism and oriental religions had elaborated ; the language thoroughly popular,[1] but free from that crudeness which characterizes the previous and more personal *Apocalypse*, the enemies who are clearly described in the *First Epistle*, here fallen into the second place ; the Synoptists known in their substance, but not literally used, though completed and interpreted with authority ; and the revelation of the Master disengaged from the shadows and, so to speak, from the language of human intercourse ? Hence also the fragmentary nature of an account which does not aim at being complete, and which is addressed to Christians already initiated and understanding what is meant by " being born of water and the Spirit ", and by " eating the flesh, and drinking the blood " of Christ. Hence, too, the disconcerting gaps, the habitual absence of transitions, the facts and the persons taken as already known, the choice amongst the Gospel signs of one single typical fact, fit to symbolise one of the aspects of the Gospel : Christ our Salvation, Christ our Food, Christ our Light, Christ our Life. And finally to this fact is due the almost constant mingling of reflections and glosses, the language that is abstract in the instructional portions, and marvellously concrete in the narrative parts, and the conventional literary processes : the use of dialogue ; groups of two, three, or seven ; careless style ; tentative forms of expression, which are finally stereotyped. And from this comes that fusion between the author and his Model which makes the line of division between the words of Jesus and the reflections of John so hard to see and sometimes so uncertain.[2]

---

[1] J. Jörgensen: *Saint Francois d'Assise*, ed. 1909, p. 343 *seq*. See also Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C.: *Life of St. François of Assisi*, Bk. III, Ch. vii, ed. 1917, pp. 346–369.

[2] Josephus (*Vita*, n. 2, ed. Dindorf, I, p. 794) relates of himself that at the age of 16 he exercised himself in the perfect life, and later in a desert region under the discipline of an ascetic named Banoun, eating little, clothed in the leaves of trees, and practising immersions both night and day, until he was nineteen.

[3] *Jn*. ii, 22; vii, 39; xii, 33, etc.

And, in conclusion, in this way are explained the credence and the absence of opposition experienced from the start by the Spiritual Gospel in the churches already in possession of the tradition and of the Synoptic Gospels. In this matter the opponents of its Johannine origin take unexampled liberties. After burdening an anonymous prophet, cunningly re-edited by unscrupulous scribes, or else the historical but yet very dim figure of John the Elder,[1] the companion of Aristion, with the formidable weight of the Gospel, and denouncing the fictions or literary frauds of those who took shelter under the name of John the Apostle, these learned ones seem to find it natural that such an audacious imitation should meet with general and immediate success.[2] For it is quite certain that the churches of which we have sure testimony (that of Marcion for the Pontic, of Justin and his disciple Tatian for the Roman, of Irenaeus and his warrantor Polycarp for the Asiatic and the Gallic, of Heracleon and Ptolemy for the Alexandrian, and of Montanus for the Phrygian) possessed the collection of the Four Gospels from the middle of the second century. And none that we know of ever dreamed of adding to them a fifth.

---

[1] Deissmann comes back to this several times, with examples to support it, in *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 54, 100, 211, *etc.* " The vulgar form πλήρης in the monumental Prologue, like an anemone of the fields amongst blocks of marble, is an important indication of the popular character of John's Gospel, and any philologist who might be led astray by the word *logos* in the first line would be put once more on the right track by this most undoubtedly crude popular form," p. 100.

[2] Lagrange : *Evangile selon saint Jean*, pp. cxlvii *sqq*.

These are the facts established by evidence, which the negative critics do not like us to remember, and drown in a flood of subtle conjectures on the sources, the literary type, the analogies, and the pagan, Manichaean, and Mandaean replicas of the Gospel. Perhaps it is not too much to proclaim in face of these tactics the saying of the old inspired prophet: *Magna est veritas et prævalebit.*

And this double character—for it is at once a spiritual Gospel and a personal, independent, and authoritative testimony—dictated the use we should make of the Fourth Gospel. Not to employ it would be to mutilate, to impoverish, and to emaciate our exposition ; simply and always to place it alongside the Synoptists, to place it on the same footing and to treat it in the same way as them, would be to ignore the profound differences which Christian tradition and an examination of the work equally incline us to consider real. It remained for us to seek in the Johannine Gospel a supplement or a complement (sometimes very appreciable) to our information; for us to set it up on another level and at a great depth, so to speak ; to find in it the inspirations, the suggestions, the modes of interpretation which we should expect from a document in which a disciple, a personal friend of the Master, had written down his final thoughts, and had brought together and explained those of his recollections which he believed most suited for imparting faith in Jesus, and the knowledge and love of Jesus.

---

[1] Who, if we are to judge by the traditions he transmitted to Irenaeus and other early Fathers, through Papias, has but clumsily added anything to the information given by the Gospel.

[2] "The legend of Ephesus . . . so audaciously but so subtly fraudulent": Loisy, *Le Quatrième Evangile*, p. 85.

Paul Wendland at least acknowledges: "The fact that John found a place in the canon [of the Four Gospels] . . . is astonishing and is perhaps to be understood as a concession[!]. We know that the Gospel did not receive this place without bitter struggles" (on this, see Schwartz, *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur, etc.*, 1912, pp. 292–293). Unfortunately for his case these "bitter struggles" reduce themselves to the impudent, late, and prejudiced opposition of Caius, and perhaps a few other anti-Montanists. See above, pp. 134–136.

# NOTE A

## JOSEPHUS AND PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

Flavius Josephus makes clear allusion to two important characters in the Gospel story. Here are the texts: Herod Antipas, by taking his sister-in-law Herodias to wife, had inflicted the cruellest injury on his lawful wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of the Nabatæans. The latter avenged his daughter's dishonour by waging a campaign in the course of which Herod's troops were shamefully defeated, and this defeat, Josephus tells us, was looked upon by many as a just punishment for Antipas's conduct towards John the Baptist,

> " an excellent man whom Herod had put to death. John urged the upright Jews, who practised justice between themselves and piety towards God, to be baptized. Baptism, according to him, was useful not for purifying from certain sins, but for purifying the body, the soul having been cleansed previously by (the exercise of) justice. And since many ran to him, being marvellously exalted by his discourses, Herod, fearing that the authority of such a man might lead some (of his subjects) into rebellion—for they seemed to do everything according to his counsel—judged it much better to crush him before there should be an outbreak, rather than to have to bewail a revolution which would place himself in danger. And on account of Herod's disfavour, John was sent in chains to the fortress of Machaerus of which I have spoken above, and there he was slain ".[1]

This political version of the imprisonment and death of

---

[1] *Ant. Jud.* XVIII v, 2, ed. G. Dindorf; ed. Naber, Vol. IV, p. 157; ed. Niese, n. 116–119.

John the Baptist is obviously complementary to that which the Gospels (*Mk.* vi, 14-30 and parallel passages) give.

The final event as given by the Gospels accords very well with Herod's sentiments towards John as described by Josephus. We can understand what force Herodias could apply in favour of the atrocious request which she dictated to her daughter Salome, from the fact that she knew the reasons of state which had compelled Herod to incarcerate the Prophet.

When he reaches the account of the death of the Roman Procurator Festus (before whom St. Paul appealed to Cæsar : *Acts*, xxv, 1-13), Josephus relates that the High Priest then in office, Annas, the son of the celebrated Annas who played an important part in the Passion of Our Lord, profited by the slowness of Albinus, the successor of Festus, to execute James of Jerusalem.

> " Albinus being still on his journey, Annas called together the Sanhedrin in judicial council, and brought before it the brother of Jesus surnamed the Christ (James was his name) with some others. He accused them of having broken the Law and handed them over to be stoned. Now this greatly shocked the more moderate men of the town and the most faithful observers of the Law, and they secretly sent [trusty agents] to the king [Herod Agrippa II], praying him to order Annas to abstain from such deeds for the future, this first act being [in their eyes] in no way correct ".[1]

There is no serious reason for doubting the authenticity of this text. The line of argument followed in this matter by Schürer, who ends by doubting it, is prejudiced,[2] and much more so is that of Jean Juster[3], who openly prejudges the question. In reality the three explicit mentions of this passage by Origen confirm the unanimous tradition of the manuscripts. The presence in Origen's text of the *Antiquities* of a phrase mentioning the popular belief concerning the murder of James, a murder which would have drawn down the divine vengeance on Jerusalem, is not proved. There is still possible a confusion on this point in the mind of the Alexandrian between what he learnt from Josephus and what had come to him from other Judaeo-Christian sources, notably Hegesippus.[1] And even if we must admit that Origen's manuscript of the *Antiquities* contained a phrase which is absent from our actual text, that fact should not prevail over the presence of the essential words: *τὸν ἀδελφὸν ’Ιησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, ’Ιάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ*, both in Origen's manuscript (he explicitly quotes them three times), and in all the manuscripts on which our actual Greek text is based.

---

[1] *Ant. Jud.*, XX, ix, I, Dindorf; Naber, vol. IV, p. 301; Niese, n. 200. Herod Agrippa II, the last prince of his house, tetrarch of Iturea and of Trachonitis, had among his prerogatives the supervision of the Temple and the High Priesthood.

[2] *GJV*, vol. I, p. 548, and especially 581, 582, with the notes.

[3] *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain, leur condition juridique*, etc., Paris, 1914, t. II, pp. 139-141. It is a good specimen of " the higher criticism." In connection with it Reinach remarks in *REJ*, LXX, 1920, p. 96, that " all the criticism (by

And on the other hand so casual and quite occasional a mention of the known title of James of Jerusalem is not opposed to the policy of silence which Josephus, like his rival and opponent Justus of Tiberias, seems to have imposed on himself with regard to a religious movement which he could hardly totally ignore. The causes of this silence are easy to understand; they have often been clearly set out. Thus Heitmüller[2] says:

> "There is no doubt that Josephus, who wrote his works at Rome during the last thirty years of the first century,

---

Juster) of the famous text on the death of James the brother of Jesus seems to be a war of words without foundation. The text is irreproachable." With all the authority which attaches to his eminent philological skill, Norden has shown that the passage cannot be broken from its context without shattering the sequence of development: *Josephus und Tacitus über Jesus Christus*, etc., in the *Neue Jahrbucher für das Klass. Altertum*, 1913, vol. XXXI, pp. 608 *seq.* This warning is also given by Meyer: *Josephus Stellung zum Christentum*, in *Ursprung und Anfaenge*, I, 1921, pp. 206–211.

Niese, the editor of Josephus, holds that the passage relative to Christ was probably interpolated after the time of Origen and before that of Eusebius. But he believes that the allusion to James the brother of the Lord, *Ant. Jud.* XX, 200, is "beyond all suspicion" of having been interpolated. *ERE*, VII, 1914, pp. 569–570.

[1] P. Batiffol: *Orpheus et l'Evangile*, p. 16, note 2.

[2] *RGG*, III, col. 345.

> knew the Christians, who had played a very remarkable part there since A.D. 64. And yet he maintains absolute silence concerning them. And that is very natural, for while formerly he had been a champion of Jewish liberty, Josephus had become an impassioned neo-Roman, so that in his works all his efforts are directed towards raising his countrymen in the eyes of the Greeks and especially of the Romans. Hence also he minimizes the Messianic hopes of his people, for they could only appear as revolutionary to the Romans. For that reason he keeps silence about the Christians, a people hated and despised by the Romans, and with whom he did not wish his own people to be confounded. His silence about Christ, the founder of the sect, has the same motive, for Christ had been condemned by Roman authority as a revolutionary. Therefore the silence of Josephus can in no way be invoked as an argument against the historicity of Christ's mission ".

But however plausible these views may be, they clash with the fact of the presence in all the existing manuscripts of the text concerning Christ (*Ant. Jud.* XVIII, 3, 3). It is true that for the last books (the phrases in question appear in the eighteenth) these manuscripts are very few, and of relatively late date,[1] but the fact remains that the passage on Christ is found in ancient versions and is integrally reproduced in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, which was finished in 325.[2] These facts do not permit us to reject it without discussion or without comprehension.

---

[1] Niese has summed up the results of Schürer's labours on this point. The second part of the *Antiquities* (Books XI–XX) only appear in a few manuscripts, of which the best, the *Palatino-Vaticanus*, n. 14, of the tenth century, only contains the last two books, and therefore cannot be of service in establishing the text of this passage. There remain three manuscripts which contain Book XVIII, of which the oldest is the *Ambrosianus*, F. 128, of the eleventh century. See *GJV*, I, p. 99.

[2] A Slav version of Josephus's book *The War in Judea*, offers notable differences to the Greek text; it also contains new and very explicit passages on Christianity. Berendts, who first brought these passages to light (*Die Zeugnisse von Christentum im slavischen* De Bello Judaico *des Josephus*, in *TU.*, 2nd series, XIV, 4), complains of the slight attention given to his discovery by the critics (see *Analecta zum slavischen*

Furthermore many eminent scholars, following the example of F. C. Burkitt in his *Josephus and Christ*,[1] have returned to belief in the total authenticity of the disputed passages. Amongst these must be named in particular W. Emery Barnes,[2] Harnack,[3] the Dutch philologist Slijpen,[4] and in his own way, R. Laqueur.[5]

The arguments of these have influenced those of the historians (and they are the majority) whom they have not convinced. As a result, many have adopted the hypothesis of a partial interpolation, already brilliantly sustained by Reinach[6]

---

*Josephus*, in *ZNTW*, IX, p. 47). Schürer, *GJV*, III, p. 202, denies all importance to what he considers interpolations of late date; but Berendts thinks that we have here not interpolations but a special and complete edition of Josephus's work, and that this edition is not the work of a Christian, but of a Jew (*Analecta, loc. laud.*, p. 70, and *The Beginnings of Christianity*, by F. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, London, 1920, I, pp. 433–435). But this discussion exceeds the object of the present note, as the passages cannot be maintained as the authentic work of Josephus.

(Attention has once more been called to these Slav fragments by Eisler, in a communication first presented to the Congress of German philologists at Erlangen in September, 1925, and later to the Society of Jewish Studies on January 17, 1926, to the Ernest Renan Society on January 23, and to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres on June 28. This paper, which was published in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (January–April, 1926, pp. 1–21) concludes thus: "The reconstituted document is of the very first importance." Reinach echoed this in the *Revue archéologique* (April–June, 1926, pp. 322–328), and the German, English, and French press considered them with interest for several months. But soon this great commotion subsided. On October 30, 1926, Mgr. Batiffol made it known, by an article published in the *Vie Catholique*, that Eisler himself had "become certain that the Slav version of Josephus was made towards the end of the sixteenth century in a monastery in Northern Russia by a known individual": a rabbi, and self-styled convert, intruded into the patriarchal throne of the Russian Church, then deposed and relegated to a monastery, where he occupied his leisure by translating Josephus into Russian, and accommodating him to his own taste. Cf. G. Bardy: *Revue Apologétique*, Dec. 15, 1926, pp. 344–353.)

[1] *Actes du IVe Congrès international d'Histoire des Religions tenu à Leide du* 9 *au* 13 *septembre*, 1912, Leide, 1913.

[2] *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1914, and especially *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ*, London, 1920.

[3] *Das jüdische Geschichtsschreiber Josephus und Jesus Christus*, in the *Internationale Monatschrift* of Berlin, 1913, p. 1037 *seq.* Other precise details and a sound discussion in favour of its authenticity is to be found in A. Tricot's *Le Témoignage de Josephe sur Jésus*, *Revue Apologétique*, t. XXXIV, 1922, pp. 73 *seq.*; 139 *seq.*

[4] *Mnemosyne*, 1914, pp. 569–570.

[5] *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus*, Giessen, 1920.

[6] *Revue des Etudes Juives*, 1897, p. 1 *seq.* The following is the reconstruction of the "original" text of Josephus according to Reinach, who has consulted the

and admitted by a number of writers.[1] Corssen, for example, holds that in the actual text, which he believes to have been interpolated, there can be found traces of the primitive text of Josephus, in which the person and the fate of Jesus must have been mentioned.[2] The weak point of these conjectural restorations is that, without support from the manuscript tradition and the various versions, they take their stand on probabilities necessarily subject to objections, and on points of style which require extremely delicate handling. The attitude we have taken up in this work enables us to avoid formulating a personal opinion, beyond the *non liquet* which seems to be necessary. And everything counsels reserve in this strange matter of the posthumous influence of Josephus. While Christian authors mention and make considerable use of the works of a man who, to put the matter in its best light, has only broken in one or two cursory passages his obstinate silence in regard to their Master and his history, the most ancient Jewish authors treated him as an enemy. They have applied to him, so to speak, the punishment of retaliation, and they say nothing, or worse than nothing, of this historian who only used his striking enthusiasm for the Empire to defend his race, pushing his apologia even to the deformation of the facts inclusively. His Jewish contemporaries, Justus of Tiberias and John of Giscala, accuse him of treason, of lying and of hypocrisy. The rabbis of the great School which gave us the Talmuds ignore him. " It is the Christian churches who have saved the works of the Jew Josephus ".[3]

---

excellent hellenist Henri Weil on the subject: " About this time there appeared Jesus, named the Christ, a skilful man (for he was a worker of miracles), who preached to men who were greedy for novelties; and he seduced many of the Jews and also many Greeks. Although Pilate, on the denunciation of our leaders, condemned him to the cross, those who had loved him from the beginning (or: those whom he had deceived from the beginning) did not cease to be attached to him, and still remain to-day as the sect which, from him, has received the name of Christians ", *loc. laud.*, pp. 14–15.

[1] e.g. Hilarin Felder, in the *Theologischpraktische Quartalschrift* of Linz, 1914, p. 608 *seq.*

[2] *Die Zeugnisse des Tacitus und Pseudo-Josephus über Christus*, in the *ZNTW*, XV, p. 134. Corssen believes that these were used as sources by Tacitus.

[3] See S. Krauss, "Josephus," in the *JE*, vol. VII, p. 279.

# NOTE B

## THE CREATIVE COMMUNITY

This expression, or the thought that lies behind it, is constantly to be found amongst the exegetes of the last generation. If we seek a philosophical basis for it, we may try to find it, either in Wundt's studies in the psychology of peoples (*Völkerpsychologie*), or in the much more radical, and on this point more profound, works of the French School of sociology, of which Emile Durkheim was the master.

As a matter of fact, with Wundt it is not the community itself, as such, that is creative ; rather, in certain cases, each member of the community can have this quality. The quite primitive, unpolished form of most myths is referred by him, for its origin, to the general experience indivisibly possessed by collective humanity. We must not therefore seek any particular author for them. The fact that a man has believed himself to witness a death in a dream or in a moment of hallucinatory emotion and that, working from that, he comes to believe in the existence of ghosts and disincarnated spirits ; or that the last sigh of a relative suggests the belief that the vital principle, the soul, is a breath, something airy and fugitive, such as a bird or a butterfly ; these things are for Wundt human, general facts, based on universal mythological laws of " perception " and " association." Consequently such imaginings do not require any author, any responsible initiator, and we can speak of them as of collective creations. But as soon as the myth becomes precisely stated in a fixed form, artistic and poetic, and as soon as it goes beyond the naive and realistic interpretation of common human experience, individual intervention must be admitted as indispensable, the more so as the fable becomes more detailed and stylized.[1]

Thus explained, the hypothesis reduces the " creative force " of the community to what is common to all in the primitive conceptions of humanity. Therefore it cannot be extended without undue generalisation to anything which bears the traces of elaboration or of definite composition. But even reduced to these terms, the theory is indefensible, as Rudolf Otto[2] has plainly perceived. Quite different is the theory defended by the French sociological school, not merely as a fact, but as a general law. For Emile Durkheim and his disciples, the community is creative, in the strict sense of the word. In society, in the community, is the origin of ideas (the ancients would have said of *universals*), and through them, of religion, morals, civilisation, and humanity itself.

In the conclusion of his celebrated work on *Les Formes élémentaires de la Vie religieuse* (Paris, 1912), Durkheim expounds this bold theory at length, and seeks to justify it in principle. " Ideas " are, according to him, " representations . . . relatively immovable and, if not universal, at least capable of being universal. . . . An idea is an essentially impersonal representation: it is through it that human intellects communicate " (p. 619).

From this it would immediately follow that it is a creation of society. " The nature of an idea, thus defined, discloses its origin," he continues ; " if it is common to all, it is because it is the work of the community [!]. Inasmuch as it does not bear the stamp of any particular intellect it is elaborated by a single intellect in which all the others meet, and to which, in some sort, they come to be fed " (p. 620). Hence the wealth of ideas : these universal representations " correspond to the manner in which this special being, society, considers the matters of its own experience " (p. 621). " They are the work of society, and they are the riches of its experience," and it is this that constitutes their value.

---

[1] *Völkerpsychologie*, II, *Mythus und Religion*, I, Leipzig, 1905, 3, *Die Mythenbildende Phantasie*, n. 2 and 3, pp. 577 *seq.*; 590 *seq.*; 602 *seq.* " In primitive mythological forms, we cannot admit collective action in which all the members of the community would be equally involved. Creative imagination is unequally divided: there are some privileged individuals who possess it in an eminent degree. Primitive legend, in its crudest form, is already an invention and is not born of itself. Someone has created it. Many have possibly simultaneously imagined it in different places (just as in the history of science a discovery is made by two contemporary scientists, each of whom is ignorant of the existence of the other). This does not prevent the activity of the individual mind. And this activity is also found in the same individualized form in the variations of those who repeat, develop, and transform the legend."

[2] " Myth and Religion in Wundt's *Volkerpsychologie*," appendix in *Der Heilige*, 1923.

All logical existence supposes the conception of " a world of stable ideas, a common ground for minds ", making it possible " to think *sub specie aeternitatis*. Impersonality and stability are the two characteristics of truth " (pp. 622–623), and, beneath this stage, there is no truly human life. But where could man have discovered this idea of logical truth ? " In collective experience." " It is (therefore) under the form of collective thought that impersonal thought (the condition of all real thought, as we have just seen, and the condition of all logical, human life) is, for the first time, revealed to humanity ; and we cannot see in what other way this revelation could have been made . . . By the mere fact that society exists, there exists also, over and above individual sensations and images, a whole system of representations which enjoy marvellous properties. By them men understand one another, and intellects have mutual communication " (p. 624). . . . " the individual realises, at least obscurely, that above these private representations there exists a world of standards in accordance with which he is bound to regulate his ideas." (p. 624). . . . It is only after he " has become conscious of this higher intellectuality . . . that he has the right to draw up his ideas " (p. 624).

" To sum up : society is by no means the illogical or non-logical being that she is too often taken to be. On the contrary, the collective conscience is the highest form of psychic life, since it is a conscience of consciences. Placed beyond and above individual and local contingencies, it only sees things in their permanent and essential aspect which it fixes in incommunicable ideas. And at the same time as it sees from above, it also sees afar off; at each moment of time it embraces all known reality; that is why it alone can furnish to the mind the limits which are applied to the totality of beings and which enable them to be thought of by the mind. Nor does it create these limits artificially; they are intrinsic in it, and it only brings them into notice" (pp. 633–634) . . . "If society is something universal in regard to the individual, it does not itself cease to be an individuality which has its personal physiognomy, its idiosyncrasies; it is a particular object and one which, consequently, particularises that of which it thinks" (p. 634). In brief, "society disposes of a power of creation which no other observable being can equal. . . . It is not a nominal and reasoning being, but a system of operating forces, . . . a reality which is supraindividual, but is within our experience" (pp. 637–638).

I have felt bound to give at some length, and in the very terms used by the man who has most deeply sounded it,[1] a description of the theory whose influence we shall encounter in many parts of this book, and which no one has set out better than Durkheim. For him, as has been said by one of the best-known of his disciples, "synthesis is creative".[2] From a union of beings who were not men or persons, that is to say reasoning and moral animals (and by the sole fact of their juxtaposition), there has arisen a new, superior entity, not only greater than each one of them, but different, transcendent, creative of humanity in these very beings:—society! And this conception, this myth (for it is one, and a typical one) is the logical, indispensable foundation for the opinions of Schmidt, Bultmann, Loisy, and all those who with them admit that the Christian community, as such, was creative of new ideas and values.

---

[1] Certainly Durkheim had forerunners (see especially *Le Conflit de la Morale et de la Sociologie*, by S. Deploige, Paris, ch. IV and V); but he was the first to disentangle a single and coherent theory from uncertainties and approximations on this capital point.

[2] M. Bouglé: Preface to *Sociologie et Philosophie d'Em. Durkheim*, Paris, 1924, p. x.

It is impossible to begin a refutation which, to be complete, would entail considerable developments; it will no doubt suffice to expose the necessary implications of this theory. It supposes that, in the higher order of thought and action, men are cells, only acquiring the quality of persons by their union in society. It supposes that this juxtaposition of beings who are not yet human has created from the beginning, and continues to create in them, faculties and powers which otherwise would never have existed. It supposes that all morality has its origin and norm in this juxtaposition, which is therefore looked upon as constituting by itself an ideal and an obligation, and as disclosing an end and exercising the appropriate sanctions. It supposes that there exists, starting from this primitive creation, beyond and above individual thinkers, a distinct Being, a single Intelligence, a Super-thought, a "conscience of consciences", which has its personality, its idiosyncrasies, its experience, its ends, its views, and its conclusions. It supposes that this Being is at once dependent on individuals, since it has resulted from their union, their juxtaposition, and has been created by their synthesis, and at the same time is incommensurably superior, as being the source of thought and of humanity, to these same individuals, because it is their Father and their God.

Thus pushed to its limits this conception betrays its intrinsic contradictions, but in a less strong form it influences and inspires a great number of minds. This is because it includes a fairly large proportion of truth. It is in fact certain that the community as such is a force, that in a group of men, especially at certain times, it gives birth to affective currents which the psychology of crowds studies and of which any given manifestation surpasses the sum-total of the forces of the individuals present. It is also true that the ill-defined ideas or tendencies at work among men find in the common atmosphere a stimulant which forces them on the more original minds of the group; in other circumstances these same men would not have noticed them, or would not have assimilated them.

But this force issuing from the community is stimulative and not creative, it is inspiring and not decisive. The work of the community, far from owing its power of definite action to this diffuse force, receives its form, its commands, and its contagious and conquering import (whether it is a question of a people or of a Church, of a social caste or of a school of thinkers) from the personal influence of more talented individuals. Where there is no master-mind, no commanding presence, no leader, the powers of feeling, tending to anarchy, lose themselves, become degraded, and miscarry. And to maintain that overheated surroundings will always, by a sort of spontaneous generation, produce the vigorous minds which they need if they are to assert and express themselves, is a gratuitous assumption of which experience does not give even the beginning of a proof (in fact, quite the contrary). The world would be different, for better or worse, if Cæsar, Joan of Arc, Luther, or Napoleon had never existed.

Through failing to recognize this truth, the theories which we are opposing, familiar to the romanticism of all ages (though Durkheim has thoroughly exposed their logical support with relentless candour), attempt to efface from religious, political, literary, and artistic history the commanding marks left by strong personalities, individual valour, and by heroes generally. This influence they make over to the adaptable agencies of the community, whose interplay and ferment are considered to have created the expansive force of all great movements. They do not distinguish the powers of determination and of choice (which are of the intellectual order, and which are always personal) from a vague power, in the order of feeling, real but radically insufficient in itself. For this reason the Homeric poems, the *Chansons de Geste*, and many other works have been long attributed, almost without discussion, to anonymous writers, "sprung from the people", to ill-defined circumstances, and to "everybody and nobody". And the same is to be said of art, institutions, and beliefs.

But these theories are undergoing an increasing and justified unpopularity, for they substitute, for forces which experience does not cease to show us as real and active, vague obscure powers which certainly have their capacity to think and to will by virtue of atmosphere and stimulus, but which do not take a definite form, in the domain of art as in that of action, save when organised by an individual brain, and directed by personal desires. The application of these inadequate theories to the composition of the Gospels neither rejuvenates nor improves them.

# NOTE C

## THE RHYTHMS OF THE ORAL STYLE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

For many years past exegetes have been aware that in the Bible there are, in addition to the fundamental fact of parallelism (an almost universal law of Semitic literature, and frequently[1] to be observed elsewhere), other rhythmic processes which are less easy to define.[2] When once these processes have been noticed (and they are especially plain in the prophetical or didactic books) it is possible to extract certain characteristic groups which balance and respond to each other after the manner of the strophes of Greek tragedy. They have been brought into prominent notice by important studies,[3] and the facts concerning them are no longer really disputable. But their precise methods, as also their real extension, are a battle-field on which contemporary exegetes hotly contend. Whatever we may think of it, the peculiarities stressed by the holders of the so-called "strophic"[4] theory are to be found even in the books originally written in Greek though of Jewish inspiration, such as *Wisdom*, attributed to Solomon.[1]

---

[1] There are examples in English poetry, both popular and learned. Cf. Adam Smith: *The Early Poetry in Israel in its Physical and Social Origins*, London, 1912, p. 14 *seq.*

[2] On this literature, which begins with Roger Bacon, see Condamin: *Le livre de Jérémie*, Paris, 1920, ch. V, wherein will be found the bibliography of the subject.

[3] The pioneers in this matter were Koester, 1831, and Proff. Müller and Zenner, 1896. They have been followed and their work completed by a number of scholars, amongst whom should be mentioned Condamin, Cladder, and Pérennès. These studies differ from the numerous poetic and metrical essays.

[4] This word, which has the advantage of comparing the newly-observed facts with literary forms already known and classified, has on the other hand the grave inconvenience of deflecting the objective study of the facts in the direction of the very different Greek and Western strophic theories. We would prefer not to make use of it.

This last fact must lead critics of the New Testament to compare the obviously rhythmic groups to be found in it with those which have been noted in the Old Testament. The former are plentiful, and partial or even complete translations of the Gospel have been printed in strophes.[2]

The matter has lately entered on a new stage, thanks to an extension which enlarges the field of comparisons, and to the use of a method which substitutes for more or less vague divinations, chiefly of the literary order, the study of the linguistic and psychological foundations of this type of composition.[3]

Many nations, as we know, have, during the long centuries, expressed their feelings and preserved their traditions without putting them into writing. And even to-day anyone who wishes to know the religion, the deep aspirations, or the historic traditions of the Taitoqs of Tamanrasset or the Yagans of Tierra del Fuego must learn from their reciters and mimes, or else remain totally ignorant. But in other circles of the first importance, the Jews especially, a number of considerable works were *brought out orally.* Sometimes they were written down soon afterwards ; this was the case, for example, with the first prophecies of Jeremias, which were written down after twenty-two years of oral delivery;[1] it was also true of large portions of the Gospels, and of the whole of Mahomet's Koran. In some cases, the actual writing was not done till after two, three, or four centuries : as in the case of the oldest sayings that have been preserved in the Talmudic treatise *Pirké Aboth.*

---

[1] See Mariès, *RB*, 1908, pp. 251 *seq.* Müller, as early as 1908, applied his strophic theory to the Sermon on the Mount: *Die Bergpredigt im Lichte der Strophenbautheorie*, Vienna, 1908.

[2] That of Loisy (*Les Livres du Nouveau Testament traduits du grec en français*, Paris, 1922) presents the whole of the New Testament in this form, except a few too refractory passages. The author offered a justification of his method, in truth somewhat æsthetic and tentative, in an article on the rhythmic style of the New Testament, in the *Journal de Psychologie normale et pathologique*, XX, 1923, pp. 405–440. He professes to recognise in it poems composed for recitation, each containing a certain number of strophes, and of regular length. The origin of these religious poems is "probably to be sought in the incantations which must be the most ancient forms which men have pondered over, toiled at, and hammered out (p. 425) . . . Hence the parallelisms, etc. . . . In the New Testament this form is in accord with the conditions of public reading; . . . imposed by the traditions of prophecy and of the liturgy in the setting in which Christianity took its birth" (p. 430).

Before this, Schmidt had restored "the strophic construction of the complete text of the four Gospels": *Der Strophische Aufbau des Gesammt-textes des vier Evangelien*, St. Gabriel, Moedling, 1921. *Ibid.*, p. 11, an almost complete bibliography of preceding efforts. Father Schmidt establishes rules for the verses (pp. 12–16), the strophes (pp. 16–22), and groups (pericopes or groups of pericopes), and gives a certain number of examples.

[3] *Le Style Oral et mnémotechnique chez les Verbo-Moteurs, Études de Psychologie linguistique*, by Marcel Jousse, Paris, 1925.

On the rhythmical aspect of Christ's teaching transmitted in the Gospels, see C. F. Burney: *The Poetry of Our Lord. An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ*, Oxford, 1925.

[See also a very interesting article by Abbot John Chapman, *Jousse on the Oral Style*, in *The Dublin Review*, July, 1929, pp. 12–25.—Tr.]

Obviously these important texts will only reveal their whole meaning to those who take into account the manner of their composition and transmission. And this very manner is a necessity of the oral style (this has been much too often forgotten), not only from conventional exigencies of a literary nature, but from physiological and psychological considerations. All language, in short, is in the first place gesture, and if one set of gestures, the sonorous laryngo-buccal, has given its name to all varieties of transmission of human thought, its privilege is not a monopoly : it neither abolishes nor renders useless more spontaneous gesticulations.

Still less has writing, figured representation, supplanted oral gesture, speech, for which it is ordinarily only a convenient substitute. In the West, it is true, this substitute has become so universally used, the advantages it offers have become so familiar to us, that we can only with difficulty imagine a society of men in which writing plays only an occasional part, or even none at all. Yet it is a fact that a social state involving the preponderance of the unwritten word was able to arise and to persist through thousands of years with certain peoples, even though they subsidiarily practised the art of writing.

---

[1] Condamin: *Le Livre de Jérémie*, p. 254 *seq.* Many other very important documents have existed in oral form before being written. "The Rig (Veda), was composed in Punjabi; it was *graven in memories*, so to speak, in a more oriental region," says L. de la Vallée Poussin: *Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens*, Paris, 1924, p. 191.

Hence naturally there is among these peoples an *art of speaking* based on the nature of the organs of gesticulation, and the more carefully elaborated in that it is through its means that the preservation and transmission of its spiritual riches are assured. Now the outstanding features of this art of speaking are essentially rhythm and mnemonics—or rather, we might say, mnemonic rhythm. In its principal components, pauses, repetitions, refrains, responses, alternations of fast or slow pace, differences of intensity, and accents, rhythm is a necessity by reason of physiological conditions in every declamation intended to perpetuate a teaching or way of initiation. It is a necessity not only for the organs of speech, but for the whole body, which naturally and necessarily participates in the recitation by movement, mimicry, and dancing. It is also necessary because of the fact that these cadences, these suppressions, these indispensable variations of loudness and softness, however spontaneous they may be, are not identical, and are far from being of uniform value either from the point of view of the fatigue imposed on the reciter, or that of the attention and the profit of the audience. Consequently a system, half instinctive, half deliberate, tends to become established, selected from the possible physiological rhythms.

Of the motives that guided this selection, the principal one was less æsthetic than pedagogic : the essential end of the reciters being the exact formulation and the sure and easy transmission and memorizing of doctrines, laws, and narratives considered sacred or important. Hence the use of mnemonic methods, partly, but only partly, demanded by their attraction for the ear. With us, rhythmic, poetic language is a refined relaxation, a matter of luxury ; for the transmission of what is essential we have prose ! But with these other peoples, amongst whom instruction is only transmitted by the living word, rhythm is before all the servant of the memory, and through it the upholder of tradition, and the guardian of spiritual treasure. This aspect of the matter dominates the methods of composition used in the oral style.

The principal is that of parallelism, with which our reading of the Bible has made us all accustomed. This insistent repetition of the same idea under differing and analogous forms was the great invention of the reciters when they had to pass on complex teaching. By means of parallelism, repetition, the corner stone of oral rhetoric, instead of remaining mere brutal hammering, became as it were the development of a material, the coining of crude ore, or the finding of a treasure. It soothes the memory, but also stimulates the imagination ; it supports even while it deepens. Finally it responds abundantly to that need in the human soul which, in order to make a loved object its own, dwells at length on its unique charm, composes a litany for it.

The use of parallelisms develops an amazing power of improvisation in the reciters who employ it. On a limited number of important themes these humble masters quickly come to possess a body of synonymous expressions which are almost interchangeable and of images mutually reminiscent. Everyone knows, for instance, what an inexhaustible flood of praises the mere mention of the Law of God calls up to the lips of a scribe " instructed in the things of the Kingdom ". These verbal riches, these catchwords which may appear somewhat sterile, are greatly relished by those who perceive their original import ; they awake in them " affective irradiations ", especially when the improviser can rejuvenate old metaphors by subtle juxtaposition, give new allusions to common passages, and make the stuff glow with an embroidery of proverbs and popular sayings.[1]

And the same necessities, the same practical considerations which have fixed the choice of the essential method, regulate also the details of the oral style. Its unity is not in the detached word, but in the suggestive action, the intelligible import of a mere inflexion of voice. This vocal group plays a very important part, chiefly mnemonic, in both sequence and concatenation. It serves less to adorn than to punctuate, to

[1] On all this, see Marcel Jousse: *Le Style Oral*, pp. 156 *seq.*

divide up and to set forth the discourse ; it is a link or a hinge for the various sequences which answer and oppose each other. What we notice is less their meaning than their consonance ; an external likeness, a verbal analogy, sometimes suffices to designate them ; and they form (to use a biblical metaphor) the tie which unites the separate pieces in the yoke which recitation lays on the neck of the disciple. By means of them essential texts are ineffaceably engraved on the memory (the complete memory in which the whole organism participates) of those who are to be initiated.

And the memory, in its turn, does not develop less with them than facility in rhythmic development with their masters. The results of such training are surprising, and make quite credible the preservation in writing of those improvised recitations of which the Bible has preserved so many notable examples, such as the most important parts of Christ's discourses, and the *Magnificat.* To say that the composition of the latter by a young girl is improbable, or that the reminiscences of earlier biblical canticles with which it is full betray literary polishing, is simply to show ignorance of the whole process of the oral style and the successful examples of it which have been constantly produced by gifted people. In places where this method is the rule, together with the habits of memory and of immediate fusion which it creates, results are frequently obtained which to us might seem legendary. Innumerable examples, both ancient and contemporary (e.g., those collected by Père Charles de Foucauld amongst the Taitoqs, or by M. Henri Basset amongst the Berbers) prove indubitably that such improvisations constructed with the help of traditional catch-phrases are an every-day matter. And very frequently women excel at this.

Knowledge of these same methods will also prevent too much importance being attached to alleged doublets in certain phrases in the Gospels. It will hinder us from applying the rigid rules of our conventional poetry to recitations which were composed for the purpose of being declaimed. We shall not, for instance, expect to find in them a fixed number of syllables or accents in each member, stich, or verse. Such demands may be imposed on a writer who works at leisure; but an improviser has greater liberty, determined not by considerations of an æsthetic end, but by the regular play of organs (memory, breath and gesticulations), with a view to the faithful transmission of the passages which have to be taught.

Oral rhythm is therefore plastic, not indifferent, but enough to break through the almost geometric forms of our conventional metres. Amongst the modern Basque pastoral singers the two parts of the rhythmic scheme which make up the whole (the verse, if you like) of their compositions are divided very unequally (roughly five and fifteen syllables). The declamations of the oral style collected elsewhere by very sure instruments of experimental phonetics do not show themselves less supple in their living complexity. From this we see how gratuitous is the intrusion of our modern artificial methods into spontaneous creations, and what an error it is to argue, with Loisy,[1] from the number of lines in a strophe, and thence to denounce supposed interpolations and editorial retouching.

If it is a question of the possibility of exact transmission of compositions in the oral style, we can say that it works with a sureness and a facility which surprises us. Madagascan reciters, American Indians, Afghans, Berbers, and Arabs repeat passages of considerable length without a single mistake, after hearing them only once. Thus Père L. Cheikho tells us[2] from the original sources how "at the annual assembly or fair of 'Okaz, Mahomet, having recalled the memory of the famous contemporary poet Qouss, bishop of Najrân, said that he himself had seen him, mounted on a brown camel and haranguing the crowd in carefully chosen terms . . . 'But,' added the Prophet, 'I have not been able to remember his discourse; who can repeat it for me?' Then Aboubakr jumped from his place and cried : ‘The discourse of Qouss is as vivid to me as on the day of the meeting. He said . . .

---

[1] *Le Style Rhythmique dans le Nouveau Testament; Journal de Psychologie*, XX, 1923. pp. 432–440.

[2] *Les Poétes arabes-chrétiens antéislamiques*, in *Etudes*, XLIV, 1888, pp. 604, 605.

In those who first ran their course
In the ages past, we have an object lesson :
Pushed on to the wells of death,
They have not come back.
I saw my people slipping after them,
The great, the poor, all of them . . .
And I said : I also in my turn,
Where my people go, I shall go !’ ”

These feats are in no way exceptional cases, such as can be found by chance here and there among our own peoples, accustomed to the written style ; whole categories of men are capable of them, however little talented they may be, amongst those peoples with whom the spoken word is the habitual means of instruction.

But in applying these considerations to the composition and transmission of the Gospels, it is right to remember that these were finally drawn up by men who had not been exclusively educated in the oral style, and in the case of St. Luke had only acquired it through the improvisations of St. Paul and the other early disciples. This fact explains the literary, editorial retouches which are to be found in great numbers.

We believe equally that the elaboration of the actual texts was not carried out in every case from oral versions to the exclusion of every written document. But it is none the less true that the form of a given passage in the Gospels is earlier and more original in proportion as the characteristics of the oral style appear the more in it. And also that certain matters of style in those texts which show remodelling either directly or by comparison with parallel passages can be very naturally explained by the hypothesis that they have been drawn up from a rhythmic recitation. Take, for example, the short speech by John the Baptist : I use here, apart from a few secondary typographical devices, M. Jousse's arrangement:

| *Matthew* iii, 7-12. | *Luke* iii, 7-9; 16-17. |
|---|---|
| *First Recitation* | |
| Sons of vipers, who has taught you to flee from the wrath *to come*? | Sons of vipers, who has taught you to flee from the wrath *to come*? |
| Bring forth fruits worthy of *penance* | Bring forth fruits worthy of *penance* |
| And do not dare to say in yourselves: | And do not say to yourselves: |
| " We have Abraham as father! " | " We have Abraham as father! " |
| For I say unto you: | For I say unto you: |
| God could from these stones raise up sons for Abraham. | God could from these stones raise up sons for Abraham. |
| Already the axe is laid to the foot of the trees: | Already the axe is laid to the foot of the trees: |
| the tree which does not bring forth good fruit | the tree which does not bring forth good fruit |
| shall be cut down, and thrown into the *fire*. | shall be cut down, and thrown into the *fire* (. . .) |
| *Second Recitation* | |
| I baptised you in water for *penance* | I baptised you in water . . . |
| But he who *cometh* after me is more powerful than I, | But he *cometh* . . . one more powerful than I, |
| To him I cannot bring his sandals: | For him I cannot untie the strap of his sandals: |
| he will baptise you in the Holy Spirit, the *fire*. | he will baptise you in the Holy Spirit, the *fire*, |
| For his fan is in his hand to cleanse his threshing-floor. | For his fan is in his hand to cleanse his threshing-floor. |
| And he will gather the wheat into his granary | And he will gather the wheat into his granary |
| and will burn the straw in inextinguishable *fire*. | and will burn the straw in inextinguishable *fire*. |

*Mark*, i, 7-8.
*Second Recitation.*

There *cometh* after me one more powerful than I,

The strap of whose sandals I cannot, bowed down, untie.
I baptise you in water . . .
He will baptise you in the Holy Spirit . . .

. . . . .

Is it not obvious that these differences explain themselves most easily if there is behind these words a single, rhythmic recitation, provided with those hinge-words which ensure easy and certain transmission (*penance*, *to come*, *fire*)? Translated, or rather traced over, and transcribed one after another in the first Gospel, they are found fundamentally with the same fidelity in the third, but treated more freely as regards detail : a few words have dropped out, and there has been some transposition rendered necessary by the insertion in a narrative framework. Finally, St. Mark has only retained an odd fragment of it torn from its context. Elsewhere it is, on the contrary, St. Mark who has retained the recitation in its original terms and sequence, while the First Gospel has only kept fragments of it ; just as one might gather the chief branches of a rose-tree in a cluster, while another might transplant it whole, just as it was, except for a branch that had chanced to fall off.

| *Mark* vii, 6-13. | *Matthew* xv, 7-9, 3-6. |
|---|---|
| *First Recitation.* | |
| *Full well* did Isaias prophesy | *Full well* did Isaias prophesy |
| in regard to you, hypocrites | In regard to you, hypocrites! |
| For it is written: "This people *honour* me with their lips, | Saying: "This people approach me with their mouth and their lips, |
| But their heart is far from me. | But their heart is very far from me |
| Uselessly do they venerate me, | Uselessly do they venerate me |
| reciting their recitations, | reciting their recitations, |
| the precepts of men." | the precepts of men." |
| For you *let* alone the precept of God, | |
| retaining the *tradition* of men, | |
| your washings of vessels and cups. | |
| *And many other like things you do.* | |

*Second Recitation.*

| | |
|---|---|
| *Full well* you violate the precept of God | Why do you violate the precept of God |
| to keep your tradition. | for . . . your tradition? |
| For Moses has said: " *Honour* thy father and thy mother " | for God ordered: " *Honour* thy father and thy mother " |
| And: " he who curses father and mother, let him die the death! " | and: " he who curses father and mother, let him die the death! " |
| But you say: If a man say to his father and mother: | But you say: If anyone say to his father and mother: |
| Corban, this with which I could assist you! | It is offered, this with which I could assist you! |
| | he has no more to honour his father and his mother |
| And you do not *let* him do more for his father and mother, | |
| making false the word of God | and you make false the precept of God |
| by the *tradition* which you transmit. | by your *tradition*. |
| *And many other like things you do.* | |

# NOTE D

## THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS

According to the evidence of Papias of Hierapolis (in the first half of the second century) which has been passed on to us by Eusebius (*HE.*, III, 39), " Matthew drew up the oracles of the Lord in the Hebrew tongue, and everyone interpreted them as he could ". In this form the original work of Matthew has perished.

But a certain number of early Fathers—Clement, Origen, Eusebius, St. Epiphanius, and St. Jerome—frequently quote a gospel " *according to the Hebrews, καθ' Ἑβραίους* " ; and the two last named attribute its use to the Judaeo-Christian community, the Nazarenes or Nazoreans of Berea (the modern Aleppo) in Syria. Sometimes to the Nazarenes are added the Ebionites, a Judaeo-Christian sect of heretics of whom Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 26, 2 ; III, xi, 7) tells us that they only accepted St. Matthew's Gospel.

*The Gospel according to the Hebrews* was, we are told, drawn up in Semitic language, and written in Hebrew characters (*ἑβραϊστί*; *hebraeo sermone* ; *chaldaico syroque sermone sed hebraicis literis*)[1] and St. Jerome adds that it existed (*ipsum hebraicum habetur*) under this form in the library at Cæsarea ; that the Nazarenes of Berea had allowed him to make a copy of it (*describendi facultas fuit*) : and that he had translated the Hebrew into Greek (*nuper in graecum de hebraeo sermone transtulimus*). This Gospel is constantly, though in various ways, brought in connection with the canonical *Matthew*.

---

[1] It is designedly that we render *ἑβραϊστί* " *hebraeo sermone* " by " in *Semitic* language." These expressions were then currently employed for works written, for example, in Aramaic, or even in Syriac.

Moreover Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople in the time of Charlemagne (806-815), wrote down in one of those works of chronology of which the ancients were so fond and in which they included so many diverse subjects, a " canon " or list of holy books received or *contested* (ἀντιλεγόμενα) together with their stichometry, i.e., an exact reckoning of the lines (stichs) in each. And among the *contested* writings appears, fourth on the list, after the Apocalypses of John and of Peter, and the Epistle of Barnabas, the εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἑβραίους to which there are assigned 2,200 lines, that is about 300 less than St. Matthew's Gospel as we have it. Nicephorus's list is extremely ancient, since in it the Johannine Apocalypse is still numbered amongst the contested Scriptures. Thus, then, we have the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* complete and in the Greek tongue at the junction of the fourth and fifth centuries, or even earlier.

Finally, a group of Greek manuscripts of the second order, which have been patiently restored by Schmidtke, who allots to them the sign Z,[1] contain a certain number of variants all referring to St. Matthew's Gospel and introduced by the designation : the Judaic (text), τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν. Some of these variants coincide with quotations from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, already known through the Fathers.

The facts which we have just set forth and the texts which support them have been collected with great care in the following works, which render others unnecessary : *Das Hebraeer-Evangelium*, ed. R. Handmann, *TU*, V, 3, texts pp. 66-104 ; Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, II, 2, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1892, pp. 642-742 ; Erwin Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, Giessen, 1905, pp. 3-12 ; and even more completely in Schmidtke's *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den Judenchristlichen Evangelien*, *TU*, XXXVII, 1 (3rd series, VII, 1), texts, pp. 32-41 ; Père Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon les Hébreux* in the *R.B.*, of 1922, pp. 161-182 ; 321-350 ; M.R.

---

[1] For Zion, Sion, because the redactor would have worked on the holy hill of Zion at Jerusalem.

James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, and *JTS*, January, 1924, p. 185; and J. Lebreton, *RSR*, 1924, p. 366.

But when we carefully study the information supplied by the Fathers on the origin and the common use of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, when we compare this information with the fragments of this writing which remain to us, we have great difficulty in reconciling all the data in one probable and coherent theory. This embarrassment is shown by the diversity of restorations proposed and also by the various *rôles* attributed to this " Gospel ".[1]

However, a few points seem to be certain, or at any rate highly probable.

1. In the vague matter described by the general title of *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, we must distinguish two works, or, at least, two very different versions of a primitive work. This fact, which was already established by Hilgenfeld in 1866, is the outcome of the surest of the critical enquiries since pursued. These works are the Gospel of the Nazarenes of Berea, a backward but harmless community, the Gospel many times quoted without disfavour by Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome; and the Gospel which was considered in the fourth century an ἀντιλεγόμενον (a title which supposes

---

[1] There is a historical summary of the question by Lagrange, *RB*, 1922, pp. 161–165. Lessing would see in the " Gospel " the source of our First Gospel! Others, such as Renan, have sought therein at least one of its sources; but neither examination of the fragments that have been preserved, nor the manner in which it is quoted by the Fathers, justify this excessive honour. In his profound, although biassed study (see Amann, in the *Bulletin d'anc. Littérature et d'Archéologie chrétienne*, Paris, 1912, pp. 45–57), Schmidtke somewhat exaggerates in the other sense. He distinguishes a *Gospel according to the Hebrews* ('*HE*'), written originally in Greek, which is secondary and clearly heretical (Ebionite), from a *Gospel* which he styles *of the Nazarenes* ('*NE*'), a free and somewhat paraphrased version of our First Gospel, drawn up about 150, and orthodox on the whole; this last would have been that which was used by the Nazarenes of Berea; only knowing it through the quotations by Apollinarius of Laodicea, St. Jerome must have grossly confounded the latter with the former, and thus led his successors into a tangle of inextricable contradictions. But for my part I believe that it is frankly impossible to reconcile these hypotheses either with the ample and (substantially) concordant information given by St. Jerome, or with the fact that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (the '*HE*' of Schmidtke) was a contested Gospel, an ἀντιλεγόμενον, and consequently definitely within the limits of orthodoxy—in any case not openly heretical.

a manifest general orthodoxy), the Gospel which is so like our First Gospel that the editor whose readings have passed into the Z group of manuscripts (see above) was led to see in it textual variants of our canonical Matthew (such a Gospel is certainly not the sectarian, controversial, mutilated Gospel of recognised heretics like the Ebionites). The notice devoted to these latter, and especially to their Gospel, by St. Epiphanius (*Panarion*, Haeres., XXX, n. 3 and 13) can, moreover, leave no doubt on that point. It is true that the Ebionites call their Gospel *κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Ἑβραίους, Ἑβραϊκόν*; but Epiphanius markedly distinguishes it from the Gospel used by the Nazarenes, which is equally *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, but more complete, *πληρέστατον*, and purer (*ibid.*, Haeres., XXIX, n. 9). That of the Ebionites is mutilated and adulterated.[1] The lengthy quotations of it which are given are abolutely conclusive as to this.

2. Furthermore, it does not seem possible to explain the confusion of names and of descriptions, without a clear connection between these different writings. If we suppose them to be the offspring of a more or less free Semitic version of our First Gospel for the use of Judaeo-Christian communities speaking only Aramaic, we explain how they come to have benefited by the name and the authority of St. Matthew.[2] We explain too their retention from their origin of a general conformity to the main lines of Gospel history, and an appearance of relationship with each other which justifies the common attributions of the Fathers. Finally we explain how

---

[1] *Ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ (Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν), ἐμφέρεται ὅτι κ.τ.λ.* *Panarion*, XXX, 13, ed. K. Holl, I, p. 349, and on the punctuation see the note, *ibid.*

[2] The beginning of the Ebionite Gospel, which St. Epiphanius gives us *verbatim* (*Panarion*, Haeres, XXX, 13), refers to the testimony of the Twelve Apostles which Matthew had been charged by Christ to put into writing. This has enabled it to be provisionally identified with the *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*, which was not held in any too good repute by ancient Christianity. See the texts collected by (Zahn) *Geschichte des NT Kanons*, II, 2, pp. 724–742. Herr Schmidtke rejects this identification of the Ebionite Gospel with the *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles* and would attribute the latter to the Gnostic heretics who were called Quongeans by St. Ephraem: *Neue Fragmente . . .* pp. 171–5.

the most complete and least corrupted edition, preserved in Syria, could have been employed by them without scruple and considered a contested Gospel, an ἀντιλεγόμενον, in its Greek version,[1] by Eusebius and many of his contemporaries.

3. It is impossible to *prove* that the first source of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was not the original Aramaic writing of St. Matthew himself, and therefore earlier than our Greek canonical Gospel. But this theory is quite improbable. The mutilated and adulterated version or edition peculiar to the Ebionites is manifestly secondary. It certainly makes use of our Third Gospel and shortens, modifies, and interpolates the First in order to strengthen heretical opinions which are easily discernible and which refer its date to the end of the second century.[2]

The other version, that of the Nazarenes, to which belong the words quoted without disfavour by the Fathers, that which Jerome translated, at least partially, and which long held the relatively honourable rank of contested Scripture, must be placed fairly high. The most characteristic *Logia* (especially that one which Origen quotes and explains twice, and St. Jerome three times)[3] attest the Semitic origin of the work.

---

[1] Did there exist in Egypt a Greek version, partial or complete? This is made probable by quotations from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (though I confess they are few): thus, two by Clement, one in the Oxyrhynchus *Logia* (the same as Clement's second), and one by Origen (twice quoted); in all three passages, but they are very characteristic. As for the Greek translation, which was certainly complete (2,200 lines), to which the stichometry transcribed by Nicephorus refers, nothing prevents us from agreeing with Zahn and Lagrange that it was the "Judaic," τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν, of the editor of the Z group of manuscripts, and even St. Jerome's translation.

[2] The approximate date arrived at by Père Lagrange, *RB*, 1922, p. 171.

[3] "If anyone accepts (the authority of) the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, therein the Saviour says: 'Presently, the Holy Spirit, my mother, seized me by one of my hairs and transported me to the high mountain of Tabor' ": Origen, *in Joan*, II, 12; the same passage is quoted "for those who accept this authority" in *Homil. in Jerem.*, XV, 4;—" If anyone reads the Canticle (of Canticles) . . . and believes in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which I lately translated, and in which the Saviour says: 'Presently, my mother, the Holy Spirit, seized me by one of my hairs' ", etc. Jerome *in Micheam*, VII, 6; and the same passage in *in Isaiam*, XL, 9; *in Ezechiel*, XVI, 13. The word *spirit*, *ruah*, is feminine in the Semitic tongue. "The Holy Spirit has just declared Jesus his son, but *ruah* being feminine in Hebrew the Spirit must therefore be a mother. The passage

Their very originality proves that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* possessed a certain authority which does not allow us to reject without examination sayings which are so unusual. That authority undoubtedly came to it from the fact of its antiquity, which would be even better attested if the phrase put in Our Lord's mouth by St. Ignatius of Antioch : " I am not a bodiless spirit ",[1] had to be originally assigned to our Gospel, as St. Jerome stated on two occasions.[2] The other *Logia* in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, of which several are very interesting, do not take us back so far. Yet the relatively late origin assigned to it by Schmidtke (about 150) seems to us to make quite inexplicable the precarious, but real, authority which the work so long enjoyed with men who had little sympathy with the apocryphal writings.

The most notable features in it are assuredly the preponderate part given to the Holy Spirit in the baptism of Jesus and the episode (almost certainly the temptation) which followed the account of it, the importance constantly accorded to the literal fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, the prominent part played by James " the brother of the Lord ", moral severity pushed to its extreme, and the rabinical habit of modifying the meaning of texts while respecting their letter as much as possible.[3] The fact that all these features are found in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (and we cannot but think that the Fathers who extracted them noted what stood out

---

evidently betrays a Semitic source, at least for its origin "; Lagrange, *loc. laud.* p. 173.

The explanation is forestalled by St. Jerome who notes elsewhere (*in Matth.*, VI, ii) that " in the *Gospel* styled *according to the Hebrews*, in place of " supersubstantial bread " (ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος) I found *mahar*, which means " to-morrow's ".

[1] Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν: *Smyrn.* iii, 1, 2.

[2] *De Viris inlustr.*, XVI; *in Isaiam*, XVIII, prooem.,—Origen (*Periarchon*, I, prooem, 8, Rufinus's translation) attributes the *daemonium incorporeum* to the little book called *Petri Doctrina.*

[3] These features which when given in detail acquire somewhat undue prominence (there is no way of giving an idea of them other than by accumulating texts) are mentioned by Lagrange at the end of a minute analysis, *RB*, 1922, pp. 345–346. This analysis should be compared with that of Renan in *Les Evangiles*, pp. 104–109, for an estimate the progress made in the objective interpretation of documents.

and contrasted with the known plan of the First Gospel) is best explained by considering it as a Judaeo-Christian work of the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, following in general the First Gospel, while twisting it here and there so as to stress the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies, and at the same time rounding it off by certain rather stiff and literalist traditions of the Palestinian communities, of which the fragments preserved by Hegesippus give us some idea, and in which the authority of James " the brother of the Lord " had remained preponderant.

# NOTE E

## THE VALUE OF THE EPISTLES TO THE EPHESIANS AND TO THE HEBREWS AS SOURCES OF HISTORY

We have not here to treat the question from the literary point of view, but merely to justify the very discreet use made in this book of these two little works. Have we a right to consider them valid historical sources?

1. To this question the reply is easy. Although, by reason of its contents and for the same considerations which so long rendered suspect the seven letters of Ignatius of Antioch, the Epistle to the Ephesians has been hardly treated by liberal critics from the time of Christian Baur, none the less its substantial authenticity raises no serious doubts.[1] St. Polycarp quoted it in about the year 110; and it forms part of the collection and, if you will, of the canon of Marcion.[2] The variations of style which are always perceptible, do not go beyond the variations one might expect in the writings of a single author. Deissmann, the greatest expert on the subject, in the course of a technical study of St. Paul's epistolary style, remarks on this: "The contrast that has been observed, as

---

[1] The state of the question may be seen in C. Coppieters' *Les récentes attaques contre l'Epitre aux Ephésiens*, *RB*, 1912, pp. 361–390, and the *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios* by J. M. Vosté, Rome, 1921, p. 53 *seq.*

[2] See Harnack, *Marcion* in *TU*, XLV (3rd series, XV), pp. 137, 148–149. Harnack aptly remarks that Marcion, in order to sustain his unyielding anti-Judaism, was obliged to assume interpolations in St. Paul's epistles. Baur and his first disciples stand on even less ceremony in establishing their thesis: whole epistles are declared by them to be unauthentic. Thanks to this facility, their undertaking "did not therefore appear grotesque"; but, adds Harnack, since they were critics and not sophists, the Tübingen scholars of the second generation were led back by the historical evidence to the positions of Marcion: Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann are "Marcionite critics": *Ibid.*, p. 240, n. 1.

regards contents and form, between the letters to the Colossians and to the Ephesians and the other Pauline epistles is explained likewise by the epistolary situation. Paul wrote to communities which were not personally known to him, and that which, in the two letters, gives the appearance of a treatise rather than a letter, must be attributed to their reserved and impersonal tone. The greatest stumbling-block (against the authenticity of *Ephesians*) is always the similarity of the contents of the two letters. But I do not see why St. Paul could not take up again in one letter what he had already said in the other ; and all surprise ceases when we see that the missionary had to deal with the same situation in two different communities ; he sends them therefore letters which treat of the same question in an analogous fashion. Finally the difference remains sufficiently great for Paul to request the two communities to exchange the letters they have received. What is most striking is the deep liturgical feeling peculiar to the two letters, but there again these notes are to be found in the other Pauline letters. The only difference is that here they vibrate with greater intensity ".[1]

So true is this that Renan, although influenced by the authority of Baur and his school, reacted from them and demanded a less *a priori* type of criticism, ending by acknowledging finally the substantial Pauline authenticity of the letter.[2]

The critics who most strongly oppose its authenticity, Johannes Weiss, for example, and Bousset, are obliged to admit the letter's antiquity and representative value. " Ignatius (of Antioch, c. 107-110) and probably also the author of *I Clement* (before the end of the first century) possessed a collection of Pauline letters different from ours, naturally, but containing in any case the *Epistle to the Ephesians*. It was therefore written in the first century".[1] And Bousset says: "If we go back further than Ignatius, further than *Hebrews* and *I Clement, and right to the confines of the Pauline era*, a comparison between the letters to the Ephesians and to the Colossians . . ." etc.[2]

---

[1] Deissmann: *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 201–202.

[2] *L' Antéchrist*, 1873; Introduction, pp. iv *seq.*; and on *Ephesians*: " Tychicus could be the bearer of a kind of encyclical, taken from the Epistle to the Colossians [that is going much too far] and intended for the Churches to which Paul had nothing very special to say. The apostle seems to have left to his disciples or secretaries the task of drawing up this circular on the plan which he gave them, or after the type which he showed them "; p. 91.

2. The value of *Hebrews* as a historical document is no less great, and since this Epistle is less embarrassing to those who represent the state of the Church in apostolic times as inorganic, or very feebly organised, liberal critics are much more favourable to it than to *Ephesians*. Loisy, in the very work in which he attains the limits of his sweeping criticism, dates this letter approximately A.D. 75,[3] i.e., less than fifty years after the Passion of Christ.

The question of the authenticity of the Epistle and of its connection with Paul does not belong to the present subject.[4] The compiler (Tertullian unhesitatingly names Barnabas, and, of the numerous conjectures put forward, that still seems the most probable) certainly belonged to what we may call the Pauline circle: the Law, which he knew and from which he was quietly detached, supplied him with terms of comparison and examples for a doctrine which was strictly Christian, drawn up in a style very different to that of the Apostle, but which can be termed excellent. It is intended for converted Jews, who have not as yet moved far from their previous mode of life; the sacrificial ceremonial of the Temple still exists (we know that it was to break up completely in A.D. 70); the growing Church which the writer exhorts to perseverance has undergone great persecution, and the object of the letter is to remind it of the hope of salvation, and that God is faithful to his promises. It has been thought that it was addressed to the Christian community in Rome after the persecution by

---

[1] Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 533.

[2] Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 285. The italics in the text are mine.

[3] *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament traduits du grec en français*, p. 17.

[4] Amongst others, it is excellently treated by Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul*, I, pp. 421-431; and by Jacquier: *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*, Paris 1904, I, pp. 445-486.

Nero, the more so since Clement, before the end of the century, made use of this Epistle, bringing it forward as a writing of great authority. But the author sends to his correspondents the greetings of the faithful of Italy (xiii, 24). Furthermore he supposes in his readers a knowledge of and indeed a long-standing familiarity with the rites of the Temple and with its surroundings. Finally he is plainly careful to instil into men somewhat dazzled by the exterior splendour of that worship the spiritual, pure, and filial worship which alone is fully agreeable to God, and of which Jesus is the founder and the high-priest. All this takes us to Palestine and justifies the somewhat vague but very ancient and almost unvarying title, which had of old been given to the Epistle : πρὸς Ἑβραίους.

The interesting features presented by this work, which is so ancient and of such a high standard, in connection with the history of Jesus, are the part which it assigns to Christ, the names which it gives to him, and the idea held of him both by the writer and those to whom he writes, which it plainly takes for granted. For example, it is by no means unimportant for us to note that the " personal, absolute, and eternal title of Christ in this Epistle "[1] is *the Son*, unqualified, and that some twenty years before our Fourth Gospel was put into writing.

---

[1] Loisy: *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament* . . . , p. 182.

# NOTE F

## THE ARGUMENT FROM STYLE FOR THE UNITY OF "THE ACTS"

This note must not be expected to develop an argument which can only be made impressive by the accumulation and judicious appreciation of details. All we seek to do is to justify the attitude taken up in the text and to show that the thesis adopted notably by Sir John Hawkins, V. H. Stanton, Harnack, and J. H. Moulton has not been shaken by the criticisms it has aroused.

Many of the scholars who reject it shake it off summarily by means of statements of a general nature in which it is difficult not to see a begging of the question. Thus Loisy, in his voluminous commentary on *The Acts of the Apostles* (Paris, 1920, p. 44 *seq.*), after treating very haughtily what he calls "the apology" of Harnack (as if motives other than those of philology and of history had influenced the illustrious Berlin theologian), concludes : "all the display of subtleties by which it is sought to save the authenticity and historicity of the *Acts* falls to pieces if it is established by an impartial examination of the texts that the book as it stands is only a continued deliberate falsification for political motives of the apostolic history as it is shown by the remnants which remain of Luke's narrative in the *Acts* themselves" (remnants which Loisy undertakes to discern infallibly by his own criteria) etc., p. 47. Quite so ! As for the argument from style, it is dispatched by an objection simply stated as taken for granted, that very one which Schürer had urged against his colleague in his review of Harnack's first *cahier*, *Lukas der Arzt* (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1906, col. 405). That argument along with two others which are much less safe is also taken up and developed by Dr. H. J. Cadbury in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake) II, pp. 161-166. It is drawn from the use made by " Luke " (we should say, so as not to prejudge anything, by the last and responsible author of the two works *to Theophilus*) of our Second Gospel. That use, for certain chapters of the Third Gospel, is acknowledged almost unanimously by modern critics. Now Professor Cadbury notes, following Schürer, Loisy, etc., that the passages used by " Luke " in the Gospel of Mark *were rewritten in the style of Luke.* He could therefore equally rewrite in his own style passages from a diary of the journey by a companion of St. Paul. And Cadbury cites as an example the story of the tempest on the lake of Galilee, *Lk.*, viii, 22-24 ; *Mk.*, iv, 35-39 (*loc. laud.*, pp. 164-165).

Professor Stanton has taken up the question again and treated it in his sound and careful manner (*Style and Authorship in the Acts of the Apostles*, in *JTS*, July, 1923, pp. 361 *seq.*). After a good lecture on method in connection with the arguments brought against the authenticity of the Acts by Windisch and Cadbury in Vol. II of *The Beginnings* . . . Stanton reaches the argument from style. In a few pages he dismisses Cadbury's subsidiary difficulties and coming to the principal one, he shows : 1. that the three verses of *Luke* which Cadbury has taken as the basis of comparison form a *unique* instance, from the point of view of the scope of the work, amongst all the passages in which it can be clearly shown that the text of *Mark* is the basis of that of *Luke* (i.e., several chapters of the Third Gospel) ; 2. that if, abandoning this narrow and too carefully chosen starting-point, we compare all the Marcan passages transcribed and edited by " Luke " with all the *We* sections, or even only the first three (which are much shorter than the fourth) we reach this result, that the strictly Lucan expressions are found to be twice, four times, and almost five times more numerous respectively in the *We* sections. Consequently we have no right to say that " Luke " rewrote these last passages in his style, in the same way or to the same degree as he rewrote the fragments of *Mark* which he used in his Gospel.

There is a constant and considerable difference between the two.

Stanton's conclusion is that " there is substantial evidence in the style of the *We* sections that they are not extracts from another source which have been revised and inserted, and that if for clear reasons (the clearness of which I have, however, disputed) it should appear to anyone that the stylistic evidence of the sections indicated must be discarded, he should at least seek to realise adequately the difficulties involved in doing so," p. 381.

# NOTE G

## ST. IRENAEUS ON THE DATE AND COMPOSITION OF THE GOSPELS

The texts of St. Irenaeus on the date and composition of the Gospels are too many to be avoided or passed over in silence. On the other hand, their apparent clearness raises more problems than it solves.[1] It would require a lengthy monograph to enumerate and discuss all the opinions to which these passages have given rise.[2] But without entering into endless details, we will give: 1, the texts with their literal translation; 2, a brief commentary making clear the opinion of Irenaeus; 3, the conclusions which can be drawn concerning the historical points touched on by the holy doctor.

1. *The text of St. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer.*, III, 1, 1 (Harvey, II, 2). After recalling in a brief preface to Book III of his work, the contents of the previous two—the doctrines and manners of the Gnostic heretics from the time of Simon Magus, the father of them all (Book I) and a direct refutation of their errors (Book II)—Irenaeus announces that he is now going to refute them by the authority of the Christian Scriptures, *as we have received them from the apostles.*

> I, 1. *Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostrae cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem*

---

[1] Cornely: *Historica et Critica Introductio in V. et N.T. libros sacros*, III, Paris, 1886, p. 76. Previously Dom Massuet had noted and deplored this in *in Adversus Haer.*, III, I, *MG*, 7, col. 845, notes 40, 41.

[2] The general bibliography is to be found almost complete in Hoh's work *Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das Neue Testament*, Münster, 1919, pp. vii–xi and notes to p. 5, 36. The only important work which has since appeared is *Novum Testamentum sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis*, ed. W. Sanday, A. Souter, and C. H. Turner, Oxford, 1923.

*tunc praeconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in scripturis nobis tradiderunt fundamentum et columnam fidei nostrae futurum. Neque enim fas est dicere quoniam ante praedicaverunt quam perfectam haberent agnitionem; sicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes emendatores se esse apostolorum. Postea enim quam surrexit Dominus noster a mortuis, et induti sunt supervenientis Spiritus sancti virtutem ab alto, de omnibus adimpleti sunt et habuerunt perfectam agnitionem; exierunt in fines terrae, ea quae a Deo bona sunt evangelizantes, et caelestem pacem hominibus annuntiantes, qui quidem et omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes evangelium Dei.*

Ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδιᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παίλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Μᾶρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Καὶ Λουκᾶς δὲ, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ᾽ ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. Ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης, ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσών, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων.

(*Ita Matthaeus in Hebrais ipsorum lingua scripturam edidit evangelii, cum Petrus et Paulus Romae evangelizarent et fundarent ecclesiam. Post vero horum excessum, Marcus, discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipse quae a Petro annuntiata erant per scripta nobis tradidit. Et Lucas autem, sectator Pauli, quod ab illo praedicabatur evangelium in libro condidit. Postea et Joannes, discipulus Domini, qui et supra pectus ejus recumbebat, et ipse edidit evangelium, Ephesi Asiae commorans.*)

"I, 1. For we have not known the economy of our salvation save by the means of those through whom the Gospel has reached us. They preached it to us then, and later transmitted it to us in writing, according to the will of God, that it might be the foundation and the pillar of our faith. For it is not lawful to say that they preached before they had full knowledge, as some dare to suggest, vaunting themselves in correcting the apostles.[1] For after Our Lord had risen from the dead, and they had been clothed with the Spirit coming from on high, they were filled with all (His gifts) and possessed perfect knowledge. They went out to the ends of the earth, announcing the good tidings of the salvation sent by God, and proclaiming to men heavenly peace. All and each of them were in possession of the Gospel of God. Thus Matthew produced a written Gospel among the Hebrews and in their own tongue, when Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome and founding the Church. But after their death Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, put into writing Peter's teaching, and transmitted it to us ; and Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote down in a book the Gospel preached by the latter. And later John, the disciple of the Lord, he who had reposed upon His breast, also wrote the Gospel, while he was dwelling at Ephesus, in Asia."

2. *The opinions of St. Irenaeus.* For elucidating the views of St. Irenaeus, as far as we understand them from the general intention of the passage and the tenor of the text, the best method seems to be to repeat what he has said, adding within brackets as concise a gloss as possible. This is the method followed by Abbot Chapman in a remarkable piece of work, which is, however, in our opinion somewhat too systematic and unilateral.[2]

According to him, it was not by any means Irenaeus's intention to mark out the chronological order of the composition or publication of the Gospels, with the exception of the fourth. His whole plan was to show that the evangelical preaching of four of the principal apostles did not die with them but that it survived in the written Gospels. Here is the ingenious paraphrase by the eminent Benedictine.

---

[1] The Marcionites. See Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 242, 243, and the notes.

[2] *St. Irenaeus on the Dates of the Gospels*, in *JTS*, VI, July, 1905, p. 563 *seq.* Harnack, *Beitrage zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, IV, pp. 90–91, and J. Belser, *Tübingen TH Quartalschrift* for 1913, p. 325, have adopted Dom Chapman's interpretation.

> "Matthew among the Hebrews in their own language published a writing also of the Gospel [besides preaching it].
>
> Peter and Paul preaching the Gospel [not for Jews but] at Rome [without writing it down], and founding the Church there [whose testimony I shall give presently, iii, 3].
>
> But [although they died without having written a Gospel] after their death [their preaching has not been lost to us, for] Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, has handed down to us, he also in writing [like Matthew] the things which were preached by Peter.
>
> And Luke besides, the companion of [the other] Paul, set down in a book the Gospel preached by that apostle.
>
> Finally, John, the disciple of the Lord, he also published a Gospel, while he was living in Ephesus of Asia."

There is very much truth in this interpretation; yet it still does not seem to do full justice to the text.[1] The following, we think, is a more accurately shaded interpretation of the thought of the bishop of Lyons:

> "Each and all of the apostles were in possession of the Gospel of God [and that is how this Gospel has in fact reached us]. Matthew produced [he was the first to do so] a *written* Gospel [distinct, thereby, from that which he preached orally] amongst the Hebrews and in their own tongue, and this was even during the lifetime of the great apostles Peter and Paul, who were then announcing the Gospel at Rome and founding the [principal] Church.[2] [But the Gospels of both of these reached our hands, for] after their death[3] Mark, the disciple and interpreter of

---

[1] See the too sharp criticism by Hoh: *Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das N.T.*, pp. 11–15.

[2] *A gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae, . . . Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter po[ten]tiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam*: *Adv. Haer.*, III, 3, 2; Harvey, II, 9.

[3] Strictly speaking, Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον could be rendered "after their departure", but this sense is not at all probable. A. Camerlynck, who had upheld it as the more probable in his thesis *Irenée et le canon du Nouveau Testament*, *Louvain*, 1896, p. 27 *seq.*, seems to have rallied to Dom Chapman's opinion and so to the "death"; see his *Synopsis*, Bruges, 1921, p. xiii.

Peter, having put into writing Peter's preaching, transmitted it to us ; and Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote down in a book the Gospel preached by the latter. Then John, the disciple of the Lord, he who had reposed upon his breast, published his Gospel while sojourning at Ephesus in Asia."

3. *Conclusions.* As for the historical points here touched on by St. Irenaeus, we can only subscribe to the reason given by the Pontifical Biblical Commission for dismissing the too rigid conclusions that some would draw from a text which is "*incertae et controversae interpretationis*".[1] If the interpretation which we have proposed (which agrees in its main lines with that of the majority of critics, at least since the publication of Dom Chapman's article) is just, it must be said that the intention of the bishop of Lyons was much less to fix points of literary history, than to show, persevering in the Church and still accessible to all, the Gospel first preached by the Apostles and consequently possessing authority to put an end to controversies. But he *could not do this except by bringing forward facts to which accordingly*, taken as a whole, and provided that we view them in the light of his principal design, *he brings the weight of his authority.* Moreover we believe that it is not unduly pressing the texts to use them in favour of the following theses :

1. Our Gospel according to St. Matthew was drawn up first, for the use (Irenaeus says elsewhere : πρὸς Ἰουδαίους, *frag. gr.* Harvey, II, p. 493) of the Palestinian Jews. It had the benefit of the apostolic authority of its author.

2. This Gospel does not give us the personal preaching of " the most glorious apostles Peter and Paul ", the founders of the Church at Rome and guarantors of the tradition which Irenaeus was presently to give as definitive. When Matthew

---

[1] *De auctore, tempore compositionis . . . evangelii secundum Matthaeum,* Decree of June 11, 1911, 3, in *Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae*, by F. Cavellera, Paris, 1920, n. 111.

wrote, Peter and Paul were fruitfully employed in founding that Church.

3. Their Gospel was also left to us, although after their death, for we cannot maintain that they themselves wrote it. It is none the less really their Gospel which we possess, for those who drew it up, Mark and Luke, were the faithful disciples of the two apostles.

4. Finally it is John, the disciple of the Lord, who is the author of our Fourth Gospel. This Gospel, therefore, which was specially dear to the Asiatics, such as Irenaeus, is equally covered by apostolic authority of the first rank, although it was late in appearing and differs from the others in several respects.

5. We have, accordingly, four Gospels which are undoubtedly apostolic, and only four: since we cannot bring forward any other of which this can be proved.

That this was the thought of Irenaeus seems clearly to emerge from the evidence of the passage *parallel to this and resting on it*, in which the bishop of Lyons shows at the same time both the error of the various heretical sects, each of whom admit only one of our apostolic Gospels,[1] and the testimony thus rendered by all these sects together to the four-fold Gospel. If they have in fact one of our four books it is because before their secession each of them was received in the Church: *Adv. Haer.*, III, xi, 7.

The reasons which follow (*ibid.*, 8) concerning the fitness of the fact that the Gospels should number four, are manifestly subordinate to the establishment of the historical fact.

---

[1] The Ebionites admit *Matthew*; the Marcionites *Luke* (in a mutilated form); the Docetists *Mark* (in which, however, there is much which might correct their folly if they could read him aright); and finally the Valentinians *John*.

# NOTE H

## THE BELOVED DISCIPLE IN DELFF'S HYPOTHESIS

Certain critics (for reasons which seem to them conclusive) refuse to attribute the Fourth Gospel to John the son of Zebedee, but many of them none the less admit the existence in this Gospel of a first-hand Christian tradition. They have thus been led to take up an intermediate position. Whether they simply substitute "John the Elder" for "John the Apostle", or whether they make no attempt to give a name to the beloved disciple, in any case they make of him a friend of Jesus, an eye-witness of what he relates, although quite distinct from John the son of Zebedee.

This hypothesis, though it is subject to slight variations, is ordinarily called *Delff's Hypothesis*, after the writer who was the first to develop it consecutively and to give it any appearance of probability.[1] It has found relatively little echo on the continent; [2] but in England, on the contrary, it has received support from several writers, amongst whom H. B. Swete, R. H. Charles, and C. F. Burney should be mentioned, having regard to the undoubted authority of these scholars in matters Johannine.

Swete at the end of his fruitful career concluded a short article (in which he declared that he had not read Delff's work) by expressing the opinion that the disciple beloved of Jesus was neither a Galilean nor one of the Twelve, but of Judaic origin. Possibly Lazarus; perhaps "the rich young man" (of whom Mark speaks in his tenth chapter). He cannot with certainty be identified (says this writer) either with the author of the Fourth Gospel, or with John of Ephesus.[1]

---

[1] Hugo Delff of Husum (Hanover): *Die Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth*, Leipzig, 1889; *Das vierte Evangelium wiederhergestellt*, Husum, 1890.

[2] Though Bousset adopted it in the first edition of his Commentary on the Apocalypse, *Die Offenbarung Johannes*, Göttingen, 1896; but he rejected it in the second edition, 1906.

Charles distinguishes from John the Apostle two other Johns, the one, John the Prophet, the principal author of the *Apocalypse*, a Palestinian Jew who emigrated to Asia Minor towards the end of his life; and the other, John the Elder, to whom he attributes the *Gospel* and the three *Epistles*. This last was a disciple possibly of John the Apostle, and probably of John the Prophet.

Burney, on the other hand, openly refers to Delff, and admits that the beloved disciple of Jesus, a very young man, of rabbinical training and sacerdotal family, a native of Jerusalem, who later settled in Asia Minor, and was distinct from the son of Zebedee, though like him called John and surnamed "the disciple of the Lord" and later "the Elder," is the author of all the Johannine writings including the *Apocalypse*. He wrote the *Gospel* in Aramaic from his personal recollections, completed by the apostolic tradition which he knew at first hand.[2]

Extraordinary as it is, this hypothesis is, if we confront it with the data of tradition and of the Johannine works themselves, probably the most specious of those which have been conceived for the purpose of explaining the certain facts, without accepting the complete traditional theory. Its very novelty constitutes the first difficulty, it being hardly probable that we should have to wait till the very end of the nineteenth century before discovering the solution of a problem which has been unceasingly studied ever since the second century.

But much more weighty and more decisive against this too ingenious story are the following facts: (i) it is totally improbable that this disciple was a stranger to the Apostolic circle of the Twelve and only tardily came into contact with Jesus, if he played the part which the Fourth Gospel allots to him; (ii) the indications concerning him in the *Gospel* itself both negatively (by the certainly deliberate omission of the son of Zebedee) and positively (by the place which they assign to the beloved disciple), whether at the beginning, when Jesus reunited his first disciples, or at the end, cannot well be understood of any but an apostle, and are given so as to suggest imperatively to us that that apostle was John, the brother of James ; (iii) the sequel of the apostolic story, especially the close connection established between Peter and John, in the narrative of the *Acts* and in St. Paul, is equally convincing on this point (and how comes it that they did not think of choosing this disciple to take the place of Judas in the Apostolic College ?).

---

[1] *JTS*, XVII, *The Disciple whom Jesus loved*, pp. 371–375.

[2] *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, Epilogue*, pp. 133–152.

[illegible]

# NOTE I

## THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN THE PROPHET AND THE GOSPEL OF JOHN THE DISCIPLE

Although the use made of the *Apocalypse* in the present book is partially independent of the Johannine authenticity of the work, the historical value of that important document remains so considerable even if, following a number of critics,[1] we were to distinguish John the Seer, or the Prophet, the author of the *Apocalypse*, from John the Elder, the author of the *Gospel* (and both of them from John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee)[2] that it is necessary to give here the reasons which make us identify all these three as the one man. The question has been recently taken up, especially on what is to my mind the most delicate point, that of the language of the two Johns ; and it has been done with a breadth and soundness which peculiarly facilitate my task. The two latest commentators, who by a happy combination of circumstances have worked independently, have in fact drawn up, each in his own way, a veritable grammar or treatise on the style, which is morally complete as regards the *Apocalypse*. When, after studying this in detail, we re-read the Johannine *Apocalypse* (its length is almost that of the *Gospel*) we are struck by a two fold fact : the literary unity of the work (which places in relief the author's decisive tone, his obviously Semitic origin, the regular irregularity of his Greek, and the sameness of his methods of development), and the diverse character of the pieces which go to make the complete prophecy. After the introduction there follows the letter to the Seven Churches of Asia, full of historical matter, and comparable in this respect to a Pauline Epistle. Then begins a series of visions in which the same story, it would seem, is taken up under various forms and sometimes with varying episodes—the struggle (supposed by the author to be final) between the Powers of Evil, at first spiritual and then (through the instigation of the latter) human, and the faithful followers of Jesus. The terrible conflict in which heaven, earth, and hell are involved, is described in apocalyptic style, but with an intense emotion, a realism, a mastery of the elements employed, and, so to speak, an inspired vigour which places the book beyond all comparison with anything of its kind.

---

[1] This is the attitude of Charles in his vast commentary on the *Apocalypse*: *The Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh, 1920, Vol. I, p. xxxviii.

[2] Charles, op. cit., I, pp. xxix–xxxviii, cxvii–clx; B. Allo, *L'Apocalypse*, Paris 1921, pp. cxxix–cliv; clxxxi–cciii. It is Charles who has laid most stress on philological study, going so far as to restore a text *sui generis* largely different from that which the best critics had admitted, II, pp. 236–385. Allo is chiefly notable for the value of his literary analyses and his understanding of the general whole. It goes without saying that these authors themselves greatly profited by the works of their predecessors, especially those of Abbott, Moulton, Deissmann and Bousset. Since then there has appeared Loisy's commentary, *L'Apocalypse de Jean*, 1923, and the first part of Zahn's work: *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Leipzig and Erlangen I, 1924, and that of Lohmeyer in the *Handbuch* of Lietzmann, Tübingen, 1926. The text of the Latin versions of the *Apocalypse* has benefited by the considerable labours of Vogels, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lat. Apocalypse-Uebersetzung*, 1920.

Incidents in the history of the day are not lacking from it : in particular there are allusions to the persecutions which assailed the Christians during the second half of the first century. The figure of Nero, especially, holds a place which, of itself alone, dates the author's principal emotion. But it must be acknowledged that other features (xvii, 10-11 ; xviii, 4) tally much better with the relatively late date[1] allotted to the *Apocalypse* by St. Irenaeus (Eusebius, *HE*, V, 8, 6). Others, again, obviously suppose (apart even from the dominant impression noted above) an earlier date, contemporary with the Neronian persecution (xi, 1-12 ; xiii, 1-7 and 10). Thus we are led to think that the Prophet finally united together in one book visions and exhortations written by him at various periods between about 65 and 90. This had been done before him by several of the great prophets of Israel, and seems also to have been done in the second century by Hermas, the brother of Pope Pius I (who was not inspired but wrote after the manner of a prophet) in his *Shepherd*. The linguistic and grammatical unity of the work compels us to admit, moreover, that the seer of the Apocalypse was not content with a mere compilation, but revised and gave a definitive form to his collection.

---

[1] *πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ αρχῆς*; Domitian's dates were 81–96 so that this would mean about 90–95.

For (and this is one of the characteristics of the book) the defective Greek, overcharged with Semitisms—(are they Semitisms of the first degree, i.e., translations of Hebrew or Aramaic expressions, or Semitisms of the second degree, i.e., Greek expressions approximating to a thought that remains Hebrew? The problem is beyond me and divides the best linguists: but the solution in no way affects our conclusions)—the Greek full of solecisms, and not free from barbarisms, and denounced as early as the third century by St. Denis of Alexandria (Eusebius, *HE*, VII, 25, 1-27), is not such for want of application or unity. This is no amorphous language, abandoned at hasard, but on the contrary language which is strong, deliberate, very coherent even in its very incorrectness, very much one in its style, which is at once popular and dominated by the Jewish training of the prophet.[1] And this homogeneity of the grammar of the *Apocalypse* should not be forgotten in what is to come.

If we pass from the language to the composition and the spirit of the book, we find even more striking unity. Two characteristics particularly stand out. The seer proceeds in his descriptions by successive advances, a second wave covering (and partially repeating) the first and leading it further towards a more striking picture or a more moving conclusion. This remark holds good both of the general whole and for the separate parts of the same vision. For example, chapters iv and v present us with a magnificent *crescendo*, to the glory of God the Father and of the Lamb. First of all the Creator is celebrated in two doxologies by the Cherubim (iv, 9) and the Ancients (iv, 11); then the Redeemer is honoured in two parallel doxologies, angelic and human (v, 9-10), in which join all the hosts of heaven (v, 12). Finally, the Father and the Son are united in one unanimous and supreme adoration:

---

[1] See the careful study by R. H. Charles in *The Revelation*, I, p. cxvii *seq.*, and the conclusions, pp. cliii *seq.* Charles compares the author of the *Apocalypse* to "an impressionist painter painting in a heroic style." This is also Allo's opinion. He considers "the Apocalyptic grammar" in its barbarous form and its very clear dependence on a Jewish mind, to be "very homogeneous," *L'Apocalypse*, p. cxlix,

> "And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, I heard all saying:
>
> To him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb,
> Benediction and honour and glory
> and power for ever and ever.
>
> And the four living creatures said: Amen. And the four and twenty Ancients fell down on their faces and adored him" (v, 13-14).[1]

This element of climax, natural to all good writers, has a particular quality in our author, in that it is not a device of composition but the result of his very personal manner of thinking. The final synthesis, the definite expression, does not present itself to him from the first, subordinating and influencing all that precedes it: rather it is the last to emerge, from a series of efforts in which all has been already said, but in a less satisfactory and complete manner.[2] And it often happens that the *tableau*, the final effect, is weak, thus leaving in the reader the feeling that something has not been achieved, a partial impression of incoherence. In the *Apocalypse* some recitations, elaborated in accordance with all the laws of the Hebrew oral style, are perfect; others hang fire, or have been inserted before their time.[3]

---

[1] Charles, *The Revelation*, I, p. 105 *seq.*, 188–295 and *passim.*

[2] See the excellent remarks by Allo in *l'Apocalypse*, pp. lxviii *seq.*, xciv *seq.* and *passim.*

[3] Loisy recognises this fact: "If the framework is mathematically drawn [that is, however, saying too much!] the scenes which are portrayed within it are not always well knit to each other or properly balanced in their own structure;

A second characteristic of the author (let us call him John the Prophet, to avoid prejudging the case), is his power of assimilation. He takes his materials where he can find them, makes them his own, and sets his mark and his seal upon them in a way that makes it impossible to confound them with any others. And that is the more remarkable in that it is a matter of apocalyptic elements which a whole series of seers had already thoroughly explored, commonplaces whose origin is almost always undiscoverable, since many of them have already figured as images, fables, or allegories, not only amongst the Assyrian prophets and the apocalyptic authors of the people of God, but also in the cosmogonies and mythologies of the surrounding peoples, the Persians, Greeks, and Egyptians. Two examples will show how John knows how to make use of outlines, images and figures without enslaving himself to them.

In the letter to the Seven Churches (ch. ii and iii) it all seems at first a vision and an allegory. Those to whom it is addressed are the mysterious "angels" of the Churches, the "seven stars" seen on the right hand of the Son of Man. From end to end the sacred number plays its part, even as the prophetic rhythm, the language and the imagery of the style (Balaam, Jezebel, the true and false "Apostles", the true and false "Jews", etc.) in the Apocalyptic matter. And yet, even in these banal moulds, John finds the means of inserting his own concrete, precise, and living knowledge of the Christendom to which he writes. It is necessary to study the letters to the "angels" of the churches of Pergamos (ii, 12-17) or Laodicea (iii, 14-22) in a commentary definitely dealing with this point[1] if we are to appreciate the significance of the

---

doublets, overloading, and anticipations are not lacking": *l'Apocalypse de Jean*, in *les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, 1922, p. 561. But the "editorial" spectre and the frenzied search for mythical antecedents so far blind him to the point that he declares the *Apocalypse* and the Fourth Gospel to be "two books . . . profoundly dissimilar . . ., completely incongruous" (*Ibid.*, p. 559). That is a very instructive example of the manifestly false results to which prejudice can lead a scholar who is otherwise exceptionally learned.

[1] Swete, 2nd ed., 1907; Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, London, 1904; Bousset, 1906; but especially Charles, I, pp. 37–102, or Zahn, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, I, pp. 219–316.

allusions, the point of the advice given, and the reality of those brief descriptions, in which there are many details, however enigmatic. As much of it as can be understood receives striking confirmation from archæological, epigraphical and linguistic discoveries.

In quite a different way, the "great sign" of xii, 1-17 is no less instructive.[1] Therein is shown the general destiny of the sons of the Woman (the Christian Church), bringing forth her child with pain as did Eve, but saved by her first-born Son from the infernal Dragon who has twice been overcome, first in heaven by Michael, and then on earth by the Lamb and those who bear testimony to Him. John makes use of the most ancient symbols and images, but also those most profoundly involved in mythologies of all sorts. In his survey of the scene he boldly presents heaven and earth, the original figures of the Woman and of the Beast (as though to indicate the world aspiring towards order and goodness, and the powers of confusion and darkness), the historical persons of Mary and of Jesus, the collective realities of Judaeo-Christian Christianity expanding finally (xii, 17 b) into the City of God. The angelic cohorts of the Dragon are shown as swelled by all those of his race, the ancient struggle of the archangels and the dire struggle opened by the birth of Jesus (xii, 5) being continued in the recent past (xii, 6) and almost (xii, 7-9) into the present (xii, 12-17). Certainly it may be said that there is in this astonishing page more than one passage abruptly introduced, that the details have not been based on a perfectly coherent whole, and that what has been borrowed from traditional imagery for these superhuman struggles has not been fully mastered and assimilated. But what is clear is the force of the thought and of the imagination of the Prophet, who mastered all that in an imperfect but sure manner, in order to say what he had to say.

Now these features, which are extremely characteristic, because they reveal the mental habits of the writer, his way of conceiving and of writing, are to be found also in John's *Gospel*. And that is why, once they have overcome the first embarrassment caused by the glaring differences of certain elements of language and style, the connection between the two authors and the two works forces itself, in various but always considerable degrees, on all critics.[1] R. H. Charles, for example, who deserves a special hearing by reason of his unique familiarity with apocalyptic literature, and who sturdily defends the theory that the authors are not identical, acknowledges, and proves (pp. xxxii-xxxiii) that an incontestable connection between them prevents us from separating them entirely. " The Evangelist was apparently at one time a disciple of the seer, or they were members of the same religious circle at Ephesus." But there is more than this, and as Burney has justly pointed out, " it is a remarkable fact that, though Dr. Charles holds that the author of the *Apocalypse* was not the author of the *Gospel*, the description which he gives of the characteristics of the former is applicable, in its main details, to the latter according to the conclusions which we have formed in the present discussion. Thus we are told that the author of the *Apocalypse* 'was a Palestinian Jew. He was a great spiritual genius, a man of profound insight and the widest sympathies.' He had an 'intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew text of the O.T.' 'The fact that he thought in Hebrew and translated its idioms literally into Greek, points to Palestine as his original home.' 'His extraordinary use of Greek appears to prove not only that he never mastered the ordinary Greek of his own times, but that he came to acquire whatever knowledge he had of this language when somewhat advanced in years.' All these characteristics are precisely those which we should expect that the author of the Fourth Gospel would display if he turned himself to the composition of a book like the *Apocalypse*."[1]

---

[1] See Allo's very fine commentary, *l'Apocalypse*, pp. 155 *seq.*, on the subject of the pursuit of analogies from "comparative exegesis", e.g., Gunkel (Babylonian origin), Dieterich (Greek, Apollinian origin), and Voelter (Persian origin), etc. Cf. *ibid.*, Dissertation XXVI, pp. 167–179.

---

[1] While saying very crudely that " to speak of a single author for these two books is to raise an objection which could not have meaning " (*Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, p. 560), Loisy is himself obliged to admit that it is not impossible that the final touches to the two books may have been given by the same hand: a passage of the *Gospel* such as that in which it is said that the Spirit of truth " will announce " to believers " the things to come ", seems to have been written in connection with the *Apocalypse*. A passage in the *Apocalypse* such as that in which it is said that the victorious Christ " calls himself the Logos of God " seems to have been written in connection with the *Gospel* (*ibid.*, p. 559). And there are in reality many other facts which might be adduced besides these simple coincidences, although they are characteristic.

There are two serious difficulties against the belief that the two writers are identical : that derived from the language employed (this is certainly the principal one), and that drawn from the difference in attitude towards the end of the world. It is impossible to treat of the first of these here except superficially. It is far from seeming decisive to certain excellent judges, such as Burney and Vogels. I borrow from the latter, whose authority in textual matters is exceptional, a substantial résumé of the question : " While the four last-named writings (*John*, and *I, II*, and *III John*) show a remarkable similarity of expressions and of style, and offer true literary unity, the differences between these writings and the Apocalypse are so great that even Denis of Alexandria considered that they made it impossible for these works to be attributed to the same hand." In the first group, he remarked, there are to be found " neither barbarisms, nor solecisms, nor idioms ", whereas the *Apocalypse* excels all the other writings of the New Testament in these. Some constructions, such as i, 4 : *ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν* · · · *καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός*, could at a pinch pass for slips, but we find similar cases on every page of the book : i, 10 ; iv, 1 ; v, 13 ; xiv, 14 ; xi, 4 ; xiv, 19 ; *etc.* . . . (other examples of Semitisms which cannot be explained by familiarity with the Septuagint). These facts give some support to Vischer's theory, which is accepted by Harnack, of a pre-existing Jewish writing adopted by the Christians, a theory which is contradicted by the literary unity of the work.

> " But just as we must not underestimate the differences of language and of style which exist between the *Apocalypse* and the other Johannine writings, so also we must notice that numerous ties connect the one with the others. Such words as *ἀληθινός, ἀπάρτι, δείκνυμι, μαρτυρία, σημαίνω, σκηνόω,*

---

[1] *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 150.

and phrases such as εἰ δὲ μή, μέρος ἔχειν, τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς are to be met with in all of them. The concept of the Logos is only found in the New Testament in *Apoc.* xix, 13, and in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel; only in these two writings is Christ to be found under the image of the Lamb; while the simile of the "living water" (*Apoc.* i, 7) alludes to the text of *Zach.* xii, 10 under a form verbally different to the Septuagint but conformable to that quoted in *John* xix, 37. Finally, in the use of prepositions, conjunctions, and constructions, we meet undoubted parallels; they are too numerous and too striking to be satisfactorily explained by saying that the two writings emanate from the same circle, and they warn us not to try to find, in the differences of style, a convincing argument for the difference of authors for the *Gospel* and the *Apocalypse*."[1]

The second difficulty noted above, that drawn from the author's attitude towards the end of the world, which John the Seer reckoned close at hand and thought of in the apocalyptic manner, while the author of the *Gospel* tacitly dismisses all ideas of this nature, is not negligible.[2] No more is it decisive. From certain features of the *Apocalypse*[3] it seems probable that John, ignorant (like all his apostolic companions) of a date which Christ had positively declared unknowable, the day and the hour of the glorious return of his Master, thought it at one time in his life to be near at hand; that he saw in such events as the Neronian persecution and the destruction of Jerusalem the signs that were to herald the final drama; and that he thought that this laborious childbirth would lead the world to its end. Still, we must take into account here as elsewhere prophetical ways of speaking and events (such as the Millenium: xx, 1, 10) which put off the Parousia to a certainly distant period. Without accepting Allo's argument[4] as conclusive on all points, it is clear that John did not teach as inevitable the speedy return of the Lord. I should more willingly admit that like St. Paul he came to learn little by little (an eminently Johannine characteristic !) the deeper meaning of our Lord's words and the wider extent of his plan. In the same way it happens that the fatigue of the first stage of his march gives a young soldier the impression that he will never go further, that it is the end ; later he judges more wisely.

---

[1] *Grundriss der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, pp. 244–5.

[2] Streeter stresses it in passing: *The Four Gospels*, p. 468.

[3] Especially ch. xxii.

[4] *L'Apocalypse*, pp. civ–cxxviii.

But we would hesitate to attribute the differences of style, of language, and of views which separate the *Apocalypse* from the other Johannine works, merely to the passing of the years and the difference in literary form. Besides the fact that certain parts of the prophetical book and its final revision cannot have well been previous to the composition of the *Gospel*, the two books are too definitely cast for us to be able to see in the first a hesitating essay, a prelude to the adoption of a definite system. We must, therefore, in all probability have recourse to the hypothesis of a secretary-translator, fusing, as regards the form, the master's discourses, which were probably first given orally, and possibly in the Semitic tongue.[1] The mark of this regulating and levelling assistant would be more visible in the case of one of the writings, probably the *Gospel*. But the two bear the sure imprint of a unique genius, at once spiritual and realistic, mystical and very delicately sensitive, a son of Israel in the very roots of his being, but powerfully impressed by certain forms of Greek thought and the terrible worship of the Roman Harlot. In the *Apocalypse* the part of the visionary prophet is greatest, there are visions from the beginning to the ecstatic conclusion :

> I am *Alpha* and *Omega*,
> the First and the Last,
> the Beginning and the End.

---

[1] This hypothesis is perhaps too convenient, but it is here almost inevitable; it is moreover attested in Peter's case, and is clearly suggested in the final note of the *Gospel*.

Blessed are they that wash their robes . . . that they may have a right to the tree of life and may enter in by the gates into the City !

Without are dogs and sorcerers and unchaste and murderers and servers of idols and every one that loveth and maketh a lie . . .

And the Spirit and the Bride say : Come . . .

And he that thirsteth, let him come. And he that will, let him take the water of life, freely . . .

He that giveth testimony of these things, saith : Surely I come quickly. Amen. Come, Lord Jesus !

*Apoc.* xii, 13-15, 17, 20.

But the part of the human " witness ", the echo and bearer of the word of the faithful and first witness, is never lost to sight. And in the same way, in the *Gospel*, where serenity and recollection have succeeded to the thunders (for there it is the Jesus of the flesh, as yet unglorified, who fills the whole scene), prophecy is not excluded.

We think it possible, therefore, to profit by the immense modern efforts which have been made in connection with the *Apocalypse*, without renouncing, as the solution even historically the most probable, that attribution of the work which, following St. Justin,[1] was made by St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement and Origen.

---

[1] *Dialogue*, LXXXI, 4, about the year 160.

# BOOK II

# THE GOSPEL SETTING

# INTRODUCTION

Before studying any evidence we have to make ourselves capable of understanding it and, consequently, of placing it. It will be useless, for example, for us to read the complete text of the Concordat concluded in 1801 between the First Consul, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Pope Pius VII, if we are not familiar with the events which preceded that great act; in that case the document, in many of its parts, will remain a dead letter for us. And, if it is so with texts drawn up in our own language and events which are relatively recent, and which occurred in our own country, what are we to say of words and actions separated from us by nearly two thousand years, and set in a state of society peculiar to itself, which forty years later, was to fall completely to pieces?

Are we to say that the evidence concerning Christ has the favourable quality of only belonging to the past? Received, guarded, and transmitted by the Church, adapted by her for all times and for all countries, it is preserved in the hearts of Christians. Far from being dead, an object of mere erudition, it survives, not simply as Roman law survives in modern law, in some of its chief features and lasting tendencies, but as a living, acting reality. Well and good; but if its efficacy has not been diminished, if the " presentiality " of this evidence (to use St. Augustine's expression), while modified, has not been abolished for us, it remains very important, and a matter of supreme interest, to study it directly in its first and authentic text.

This study, which strengthens the faith of believers, also enlightens those who are still searching or those who have been troubled by the opposition (frequently put forward of late) between " the Christ of history " and the " Christ of faith ", between Jesus of Nazareth, the founder of the Kingdom of God, the prophet (in the wide sense of the word) who none the less shared all the limitations of his race and his time, and the Lord Jesus, the Christ and the Son of God. Under various forms, this distinction has spread, so that it has passed even into relatively moderate works such as the *Katholizismus* of Heiler.[1] It is not improved by it. That this distinction is without real foundation, that there is no opposition between " the Christ of history " and the Christ of the faith, and that there is no mere development of a deified hero from an inspired prophet, is what all this book will show. But it is clear that this sincere research work, if it is to have a chance of reaching its end, must be based on an exact understanding of the primitive message of Jesus. And this understanding, in its turn, requires an exposition which will display it in its own setting.

The outline of the story of the preaching of the Gospel is known to us, partly by the Gospels themselves, partly by documents and monuments[2] of all kinds which can be dated with certainity or with very great probability, from the centuries which precede or which immediately follow the beginning of the Christian era. We shall try to make use of them here, following only those results which can be regarded as definite.

---

[1] " It was not the man Jesus who established this connection, but *Kyrios Christos*. " Nietzsche supplied an attempt at a philosophical justification of this critical thesis by maintaining that, in certain circumstances, the part of initiator could be limited to that played by the match which fires the train.

[2] It would require a long technical study to present and date this considerable literature, which is largely anonymous or pseudonymous, more especially as several of the chief documents, the *Book of Henoch*, for example, are the consequence of artificial groupings of the writings of years many of which are of very varying natures. Unfortunately we possess many of them only in translations of comparatively late date, and there are often doubts about even the language in which the original was written. In contrast to these difficulties, which no serious writer can ignore, an impressive number of documents can be dated approximately but surely; and the greater number can, in their main lines, be interpreted without fear of error.

## I. THE POLITICAL CONDITION OF THE JEWISH WORLD

The people of Israel,[1] descended from their "Father Abraham" (*Lk.* xvi, 24), were, in evangelical times, subject to two quite distinct forms of government, according as the sons of the twelve tribes of Israel dwelt in the Holy Land (where they formed the main part of the population, perhaps[2] two million men) or dispersed here and there in Jewish colonies amongst the Gentiles. To these colonies was given the common name of the Dispersion (*διασπορά*). Only one place in the world was accepted by Jahveh for his public worship, the Temple at Jerusalem, which had been rebuilt by Zorobabel after the Babylonish exile, and then reconstructed and decorated by Herod the Great. By reason of the laws of Deuteronomy, the Jews of the Dispersion had not temples of their own; and this severe enactment, which powerfully helped to maintain union between the dispersed and Jerusalem, seems to have been faithfully observed.

Until recent years only one exception to this was known, that of the temple which was restored and consecrated to Jahveh[3] about 164-162 B.C. at Leontopolis (a province of Heliopolis in Egypt), by the son of the High Priest Onias III, on the authority of Ptolemy VI, Philometor.

But certain papyri in the Aramaic tongue which were discovered in 1905 have brought to our knowledge the intimate life of an important Jewish colony at Elephantine on the borders of Ethiopia, by the First Cataract of the Nile. We know the details of their life between the years 471 and 406 B.C. and it appears from this document that the Jews had there an actual temple, dedicated to their God Jahveh (Jaho or Jahù), and that it had existed from the time of the last campaign of Cambyses in Egypt (525 B.C.). Having been destroyed by the priests of the ram-god Khnum in 409, with the connivance of the governor Widrang, it was again rebuilt in 406, the date of the application in which permission is asked for rebuilding it from Bagohi, the administrator of Judaea in the name of Darius II.

---

[1] The name *Jew* was first given to those who were sprung from the tribe of Juda, but after the return from the captivity it was extended to all Israelites.

[2] The census of January 1922, gave 761,796 inhabitants for Palestine, of whom about 210,000 belonged to the district of Jerusalem, and 85,000 to Galilee, but that country was certainly then more thickly populated. We shall not be far wrong if we fix the number of its inhabitants at nearly a million. The only information we have that is at all authoritative is that given by Josephus on the population about A.D. 65 (*Bell. Jud.*, III, 3). Even if we consider his figures to be exaggerated, we can scarcely reckon the inhabitants of Galilee alone at less than a million. Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 16) suggests for the whole of Palestine two and a half millions. See also Moffatt, "Population," in *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, II, 1909, p. 383.

[3] Cf. Fries: *Iahvetempel ausserhalb Palästinas*" in *Beitrage zur Religionswissenschaft*, p. 10 *seq.*, published by the *Religionswissenschaftl. Gesellschaft in Stockholm* I, Stocholm, 1924, pp. 143–165.

The dispersed supplied the place of sacrificial worship in the strict sense by gatherings held on the sabbath days in the "synagogues"[1] or "places of prayer,"[2] which were both schools and prayer-houses. In these gatherings the scribes[3] or lawyers (if there were any there) played an important but not an indispensable part. The service opened with the recitation of the *Shema*, composed of three passages of the Pentateuch[4] accompanied by blessings. A prayer was said by one of the assistants, with his face turned towards Jerusalem, all the others responding with *Amen*. There followed selected readings from the Bible, accompanied by translations in the vulgar tongue (Aramaic or Greek, according to the place); a homily delivered by a scribe, and finally a blessing (which was replaced by a prayer when there was no priest present). The chief officials of the synagogue, the leader (ἀρχισυνάγωγος) and the server (ὑπηρέτης, *hazzan*) were generally strangers to the tribe of Levi.

---

[1] The word *synagogue* was first applied to the community, and it was only little by little that the name passed to the building which was its centre. The institution of synagogues in this derived sense is subsequent to the exile of 588 B.C. Certain traces of it are found in Egypt during the second half of the third century B.C.; but their multiplication in Judaea seems to have been more tardy, though in Gospel times they had undergone considerable development. See Moss, *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, II, 689–692; and Strack, "Synagogue," *REP*, XIX. 1907, 223–226.

[2] [In the Greek: *προσευχαί*.—TR.]

[3] Scribes: *γραμματεῖς*, the lettered; in Hebrew, *soferim*. St. Luke sometimes calls them *νομικοί*, *νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, which best expresses their true character; people who have *ex professo* studied the Law and whose business is to explain it. See below, pp. 266, 271 *seq*.

[4] *Deut.* vi, 4–9: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength" etc. *Deut.* xi, 13–21; *Num.* xv, 27–41.

The first of these was the leader of the community, analogous to the churchwarden of our old parishes, or to the *principal* of the Christians in missionary countries. The server in the smaller synagogues assumed the duties which elsewhere devolve upon the sacristan, the bellringer (but in this case there were no bells but a trumpet), the schoolmaster, the reader, the corrector, and even the interpreter (*methurgeman*).

Everywhere where there was a Jewish group there was a synagogue, and if this group was numerous, there were several.

Colonies of this kind extended in the first century over the whole Greek and Roman world, and reached even its frontiers.[1] These communities, which were sometimes notable for the number of their members, were almost always important by reason of their close interconnection, their resources, and their boldness. When L. Valerius Flaccus, the prætor of Asia Minor, took it into his head in 62–60 B.C. to seize the sums of money sent to the Temple by the Jews in his province, he obtained one hundred and twenty gold pounds, which points to a Jewish population of nearly two hundred thousand souls.[2]

Cicero, who pleaded for Flaccus in 59 B.C., after mentioning the remarkable weight of Jewish gold, observed that the ordinary place for the courts had had to be changed because of the Israelites, and affected to speak in a low voice so as to avoid the danger which their turbulence might create.[3] We will grant that there is a certain amount of oratorical artifice about that; but it remains certain that the Jews obtained privileges, exemptions, and facilities for their religious

[1] Schürer, *GJV*, III, pp. 1–70, gives a detailed and critical list of the places in which the presence of Jewish colonies is proved. So also by Juster: *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain*, Paris, 1914, I, pp. 179–209. Cf. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 515, note 2, on Jewish exaggerations on that point, and the texts quoted.

[2] See Reinach, *Judaei*, in *DAGR*, III, I, p. 622, A. Every male adult Jew had to send the equivalent in gold of two Greek drachmas, i.e., about 8 gr. 5.

[3] *Pro Flacco*, XXVIII, 66 " . . . *auri illa invidia iudaici* . . . (*Laeli*), *scis quanta sit manus, quanta concordia* . . . *Summissa voce agam* ".

life to some extent everywhere, and especially on account of the services rendered by them to Cæsar's cause in Egypt. Despite passing storms, this favour was maintained, and their influence could not but increase. Latin authors of the Imperial epoch are not silent about the Jews, and their very pleasantries, gross and unintelligent as they are, show how prominent and how much feared these people were.[1] In every town of any importance from the first century of our era there was a Jewish quarter. Amongst the pilgrims going up to Jerusalem for the Pasch (according to Josephus they brought up the number of inhabitants of the Holy City at that season of the year to nearly three millions) the book of the *Acts* mentions Jews who were "Parthians and Medes and Elamites and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judaea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews also and proselytes,[2] Cretes and Arabians" (*Acts* ii, 9–12). How were these numerous and often powerful colonies constituted? It is difficult to say in every case.

In Mesopotamia and the neighbouring lands, it is certain that considerable groups of Jews remained tied to the soil to which the anger of the Great Kings had transplanted them, even after their brethren, in 536, had returned to Palestine. We know also from the prophecies of Jeremias that in his time (about 600 B.C.) a large number of prominent men emigrated to Egypt. Besides this, there are weighty reasons of commerce, of business and brokerage, which (if we recall the proverbial fecundity and grasping eagerness for success which characterize the race) explain the great fact of the Dispersion.

Elsewhere Jewish colonies grew larger, and not solely through their high birth-rate. We have seen in the passage we have quoted from the *Acts* the mention of "proselytes" (προσήλυτοι) from Rome; and in the Gospels there is also allusion to these proselytes (*Mt.* xxiii, 15). Elsewhere, scattered through the *Acts*, we find mentioned as a class apart, in the life of the synagogues, those who " fear God ", those who " adore God ",[1] *φοβούμενοι, σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν; metuentes, timentes Deum* (*Acts*, x, 2, 22; xiii, 16, 26; *colentes; Acts*, xiii, 43, 50; xvi, 14, etc.). The first expression should not make us think of aliens, of foreigners settled in the midst of a people without making part of it, such as the *gerim* mentioned in the Old Testament. In Gospel times proselytes amongst the pagans who were foreign to the race of Abraham were those converts who took upon their shoulders the whole yoke of the Law, including circumcision, and at this price became sons of Israel in the full sense of the word. They were naturally more or less rare; the greater number of those who had been affected by Jewish propaganda, which was then very active, stopped at the threshold of the Law. While they accepted the essential beliefs and a part of the Jewish practices,[2] they did not go so far as circumcision and an embracing of complete Judaism. It is to such as these that the expressions " fearing God ", " adoring God " is applied. They were rather candidates for Judaism than Israelites in the true sense, at least in so far as what concerned them personally. A certain number of them had their children circumcised, thus giving them the full rights of Israelites.[3]

---

[1] Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaisme*, Paris, 1895, 1914; Staehelin, *Der Antisemitismus des Altertums*, Basle, 1905; and Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain, leur condition juridique, économique et sociale,* 2 vols., Paris, 1914.

[2] i.e., the "strangers of Rome"

Amongst the Ghettos of the Dispersion special mention should be made of that at Alexandria, the largest of all and also the best known. In the time of Philo, who was older than Christ but survived him, two of the five districts of the great

[1] " The Ayras of the Vedic period are described, not without reason, as a people seeking God, *àdevo janas*, and turning impartially to the gods to ask their help ": E. W. Hopkins, *Ethics of India*, New York, 1924, p. 15.

[2] Those practices which were more easily born were sometimes called (from a name used by the later rabbis) " the precepts of Noe ", Noe being considered the type of the just before the promulgation of the Mosaic Law. Cf. " Noachian Precepts " in *ERE*, IX, pp. 379, 380 (Kay).

[3] The description *proselytes of the gate*, which has long been given to them, seems to have been a very much later, indeed, medieval, rabbinical expression. See Lagrange: *Le Messianisme*, Paris, 1909, pp. 278–282; Dobschütz, *REP*, XVI, pp. 112–123 (3rd ed.); and the profound study by Schürer, *GJV*, pp. 150–188; on the " proselytes of the gate ", pp. 177–180.

Egyptian city (having perhaps half a million inhabitants) were called *Jewish*, from the great number of Jews who dwelt in them. Philo adds that the Israelites were not all confined to these districts, and estimates at a million the total number of Jews living in Egypt (*In Flaccum*, n. 8). Faithful to the Law and (despite the temple at Leontopolis) even, in a great measure, to the Temple at Jerusalem, which they sustained by their contributions and visited as pilgrims, the Alexandrian Jews enjoyed a certain degree of independence. It was for them and by them that the Holy Books, at least the Pentateuch,[1] had been translated for the first time into Greek, in the third century before Christ. It was by them that the prophetic literature of the ancient Sibyl was, from the middle of the second century before Christ, used in their denunciation of the corrupted manners of the Gentiles which were opposed to the moral purity and piety of the Jewish people.[2] And it was also by them, though not exclusively, that contact was established and maintained between Greek thought and the religion of Israel, between philosophy and Wisdom.

While they were less powerful elsewhere, the Jewries had still great influence at Cyrenaica, in Syria, Asia Minor, and Rome. It is to them, or their neighbourhood, that we are taken by the missions of St. Paul described in the *Acts*. He and his companions, Barnabas, Silas, Apollos, and Titus, preached Jesus crucified first in the synagogues and prayer-houses ; and it was from them, and especially from the group of souls who were of good will, " fearing God ", which gravitated round them, that the first converts came. In revenge, it was they who turned against the Christians who had shaken off the Law, who provoked the first persecutions and enraged the populace, thus earning the name of "*fontes persecutionum*," which was later fastened on them by Tertullian. Scandalized by the mystery of the Cross, the Israel of the flesh pitilessly oppressed the spiritual Israel which God had substituted for it.

---

[1] Redpath, " The Dates of the Translation of the various Books of the Septuagint," in *JTS*, VII, pp. 606, 615; St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (the Schweich Lectures, 1923), Lecture, I, pp. 7–40.

[2] This description is to be found, as is well known, in the third book of the existing Collection of the *Sibylline Books*, which consists of fourteen books of pagan, Jewish, and Christian origin, whose composition, remodelling, and interpolations extend over at least five centuries; cf. Geffcken, in *RGG*, V, coll. 619–623; Lanchester, in *ERE*, XI, 1920, pp. 496–500.

In contrast with this dispersed nation (which was however strongly maintained in its main features by the Law, by custom, and race) crumbling yet not submerged in the mass of Gentiles, we must briefly describe the main body of the nation which occupied the soil of the Holy Land at the time that John the Precursor began to preach. St. Luke tells us that it was " the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being Tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip his brother tetrarch of Ituraea and the country of Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene : under the high priests Annas and Caiaphas . . ." (*Lk.* iii, 1–2). This medley of names, titles and duties warns us from the start that we have to deal with a complex state of affairs. The fact is that the political unity re-established in Palestine by Herod the Idumæan at the cost of an atrocious war of three years' duration (40-37 B.C.) had been again broken down. This half-Jew,[1] crafty and cruel, who was to complete his reign with the massacre of the Innocents, did at least enforce order and obtained, even if he did not merit it, the name of " the Great ".[2] He reigned from 37 to 4 B.C.[3]

In his time the Temple was magnificently rebuilt, peace was maintained, the pride of the sacerdotal families was humbled, and the marked hellenism of the prince, together with his constant devotion to the more powerful of the Romans, was limited by a sure instinct for the critical point beyond which Jewish endurance would give place to despair and revolt. The dark intrigues of the palace and the unforgivable murders which blackened the last years of the reign did not prevent Augustus from ratifying the chief features of the Idumæan's will. This divided his land[1] between his three surviving sons—he had put to death his three elder sons.[2] By this will Archelaus received Judaea; Herod Antipas (who beheaded John the Baptist and appears in the story of the Passion) was given Galilee and Peraea; while Ituraea and the north-eastern districts went to Philip.

---

[1] Josephus calls him ἡμιιουδαῖος, (*Ant. Jud.*, XIV, 15, 2), but in reality that is saying too much. For, as the son of the Idumæan Antipater, the all-powerful mayor of the palace to Hyrcanus II, and of the Arabian princess Cypros, " he had not a single drop of Jewish blood in his veins ". Cf. Walter Otto, *Herodes*, in *RECA*, Supplement II, coll. 1–158 (reprinted under the title *Herodes* in *Beitraege zur Geschichte des letzten judischen Königshauses*, Stuttgart). This is in fact the most complete monograph on the Herodian family.

[2] Otto contests the significance of the name, ὁ μέγας (coll. 145–146), which can in fact mean not " the great ", but " the elder". However, it certainly seems that Herod's fame must have been considerable, and Otto himself says that the men of the Italian Renaissance would have called him " *il Magnifico* "(col. 158).

[3] We know that the popular era begins several years (at least five, possibly six or seven) after the birth of Jesus. See Prat, *RSR*, Jan. 1912, pp. 82 *seq.*; and Schürer, *GJV* (4th ed.), I, p. 415 *seq.*, note 167.

By the year 30 only the last two retained their dominions. To appreciate their actual power we may compare it with that of the princes of "protectorates" such as Tunisia and Morocco, and especially with that of the rulers of the "Independent States" of India. Thus the great Maharajahs have troops, an administration, and finances of their own, while they recognize the sovereignty of the British Crown. They take great care that their more important acts are not displeasing to Downing Street. In Judaea (properly so-called) Archelaus made himself so unpopular that his subjects forwarded to Rome a petition against him. Augustus received it in A.D. 6 and in consequence placed the province directly under a Roman magistrate, who was a mere Procurator (we [French] should call him a *Lieutenant-Gouverneur*) of the Proconsul of Syria, and resided on the coast at Cæsarea, whence communication with Rome was none too easy. His habitual absence from Jerusalem, to which he went every year with a strong escort at the time of the Feast of the Passover, together with the care taken by the Romans to leave to subject peoples a portion or a shadow of autonomy, meant that the high council of the nation, the Sanhedrin, which had been almost abolished during Herod's reign, regained a certain amount of independence. Composed of seventy-one members, "princes of the priests" (ἀρχιερεῖς: chiefs of the principal families of sacerdotal caste), "scribes" (γραμματεῖς: doctors expert in the interpretation of the Law), and "elders" (πρεσβύτεροι: senators), the Sanhedrin was presided over at great functions by the high priest. In the time of Jesus, this tribunal was in actual fact the sole Jewish authority[1] in matters political and religious.

---

[1] The Holy Land, strictly speaking, or Palestine, in its classical limits, "from Dan to Bersabee", is reckoned by the surveyors of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, at 9,700 English square miles. In square kilometres this would be about 28,000. This is very nearly the same size as Sicily (9,930 square miles), or of Belgium (10,000 square miles). All these figures for Palestine are to be understood as approximate: the frontiers are changeable. See above, p. 253, the note on population.

[2] Antipater, the son of Doris, and Alexander and Aristobulos, the sons of Mariamne the Hasmonean, through whom Herod had united his dynasty to that of the Machabees. On Herod's ten wives and their lineage, see the genealogy drawn up by de Saulcy, *Histoire d'Hérode*, Paris, 1867, app. 2 (the genealogy of Herod and of his descent); and more completely, by Otto, *loc. cit.*, col. 15–16.

To sum up: when Jesus came to be baptised by John, the Jewish people dwelling in the Holy Land were distributed in distinct political groups, subject to different governments: in the north there were the regions governed by the two sons of Herod; in the south was the immediate control of the procurator; and over all the imperial hegemony. But all this left a large field open for parties, groups, and local customs. Thus Rome tolerated the connection of the διασπορά with the Holy City, the annual tribute, and the pilgrimages of the Jews of the Dispersion to Jerusalem, and, on the one condition that she remained mistress, she willingly accorded to the Jewish colonies dispensations, rights, and sometimes very desirable privileges. It is with Imperial England that we have to compare this if we are to make the situation real.

---

[1] This point, which bears upon the history of Jesus, has been disputed by certain learned Israelites, who rest their case upon Talmudic indications of very late date. Adolphe Büchler, *Das Synhedrion in Jerusalem*, Vienna, 1902, defended the theory of *two* distinct tribunals, one of which was exclusively charged with cases of a religious nature, and this view was adopted in the *JE*, XI, pp. 41–46, "Sanhedrin", by J. Z. Lauterbach. But the Gospel texts, in full accord with those of Josephus and the indications which can be drawn from the re-establishment of the Sanhedrin by Iabne after the catastrophe of A.D. 70, coincide in proving that there was only one single tribunal with universal jurisdiction. See Schürer *GJV*, II (4th ed.), p. 245 *seq.*, and Adam Smith, *Jerusalem, the Topography, Economics, and History*, Edinburgh, 1908, I, p. 418 *seq.*; Strack, *REP*, XIX pp. 226–228, "*Synedrium*". The two opinions are cited by I. Abrahams, "Sanhedrin" *ERE*, XI, p. 185, but he comes to no conclusion.

Thus protected, the Israel of the Dispersion (groups of which had gathered almost everywhere, though very unequally, throughout the ancient oriental and Mediterranean world) preserved an autonomy based on the racial community, on the jealously guarded unity of faith, of religious and national hopes, and of practices, and on severe prohibitions in the matter of marriage and even of social intercourse.

## II. THE SOCIAL SETTING

If the political chart of the Jewish world towards the end of the third decade of our era is not difficult to map out, the same cannot be said of that which seeks to place before our eyes the social and intellectual state of the nation. A first distinction must be made between the leaders and the common people. We see in the Judaea of those days, less perhaps than elsewhere, but in the same way, rich and poor, " the great ones of the flesh " and the small, persons of quality and the populace. As always happens, the first class are the better known to us : it is they who, in very great measure, make history, and it is always they who write it. And it is chiefly with them that we are concerned in this chapter. But if we were to forget the others we should run the danger of not understanding the Gospels, and it is the Gospels which offer us the most vivid pictures of these. Leisured artisans, and fishermen who could be more easily detached from their boats than labourers could be uprooted from their soil, the apostles of Jesus almost all belonged to that little world of true Israelites, without guile and without artifice, formed on the model made familiar to us by the Wisdom literature and the Psalms.

The Master praised them in the person of Nathaniel (*Jn.* i, 4) and, which is much more, he called them to him. Jewish scholars who strive to explain and to diminish the contrast between the Gospel and the Pharasaic ideal locate the difference in the fact that, far from repulsing these men as incapable of sharing in the Kingdom of God, Jesus opened the door wide to them. He went lower than that, even to sinners and publicans, but chiefly he talked familiarly and in friendly fashion with the ignorant, the rude, and " this accursed multitude which knoweth not the Law " (*Jn.* vii, 49).[1]

Above these masses of the people, whom we shall meet again when commenting on the message of Jesus, we find, ruling them or at least distinct from them, at this period in Judaea, " the rich and prudent " whose importance was assured to them by their birth, fortune, and knowledge of the Law.

The *Herodians*[2] are three times mentioned in the Gospels (*Mk.* iii, 6 ; xii, 13 ; *Mt.*, xxii, 16). Without constituting a particular sect, analogous to those which will be described below, these politicians, who were resigned to the Roman rule, and were devoted to or rallied to the power of the Idumæan princes, were recruited from the families which the state of affairs existing under the Herods had not too much offended or injured. They saw in this government a more or less tolerable middle term half-way between total subjection to the Empire and an independence which they no longer believed to be possible. The words spoken at the meeting of the Sanhedrin about the miracles and increasing popularity of Jesus[3] express very fairly the timid wisdom of the Herodians and the proximity of Rome which made them desire, and almost love, the scarcely national dynasty of the Herods.

At the other extremity of the political rainbow, a turbulent, fanatical group, the *Zealots*, were jealous observers of the Law, and, as such were Pharisees and no more. What enabled

---

[1] " It was only in his relations with the impure unwashed crowd, with the *'am-ha'arez* (the clodhoppers, the rustics, the peasants), the publicans and the sinners, that Jesus differed greatly from the Pharisees ": Kaufmann Kohler, *JE*, " Pharisees ", IX, p. 665 B. On the poor in Israel there may be consulted, with caution, Causse's monograph: *Les Pauvres d'Israel*, Strasbourg, 1922. Cf. Isidore Loeb; *La Littérature des Pauvres dans la Bible*, Paris, 1892.

[2] Otto, *Herodianoi*, *RECA*, Supp. II, 1913, coll. 200–202. He states that " Herodians " means Jews friendly to the Romans, and gives a discussion of other hypotheses.

[3] " If we let him alone so, all will believe in him; and the Romans will come, and will take away our (holy) place and (the very name of our) nation ": *Jn.* xi, 48.

Josephus to distinguish them from the main body of the Pharisees was the fact that, being before all else nationalists, the Zealots were the declared enemies of all foreign domination. Already formed in Gospel times, this turbulent minority increased as a consequence of the troubles which followed the ephemeral reign of Herod Agrippa I, who died in 44. It fomented and fanned the successive revolts which led to the capture and sack of Jerusalem in 70.

The *Essenes*, who are somewhat obscure and are only known through occasional (though detailed and friendly) passages in Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder,[1] have greatly aroused the curiosity of scholars and have driven not a few amateur historians to delirium. They formed cenobitical groups, freely recruited, and their chief centres were situated around the Dead Sea. According to Josephus they numbered as many as four thousand. Their origin is unknown: but traces of them are found possibly towards the middle, and certainly towards the end of the first century B.C. After undergoing a postulancy of one year, they were initiated and given a knife, a belt, and a white robe. They kept themselves, worked with their hands, as a general rule preserved celibacy,[2] did not keep slaves, and did not engage in commerce.

As all goods were held in common, meals were taken together, with a grave and religious solemnity. Their scrupulous, concerted, almost ritualistic care of personal cleanliness, and their abstention from blood sacrifices, might make us think that the Essenes were very different to other Israelites.

In reality, they were (although following their own particular course) true Jews, faithful to the fundamental beliefs of Judaism, strict observers of the Law, and especially of the Sabbatarian precepts, great readers of the Holy Books, who sent their offerings regularly to the Temple at Jerusalem. If Schürer goes too far in calling them " decided Pharisees " (for their faith seems rather to have turned towards the immortality of the soul than to the resurrection of the body), if certain characteristics seem to betray foreign origin and discipline (possibly Greek or Pythagorean, more probably Iranian), the Essenes remain for all essentials within the religious body of Israel. In any case, nothing could differ more from primitive Christianity, which could at the most see in them an example, when for some time putting into practice at Jerusalem the common holding of property. In other respects, that is to say in almost all its characteristics (its rigid legalism, its scrupulous attention to corporal and saving purifications, its moral rigorism extending normally to prohibition of marriage, and its aloofness from all that was sinful, common, or profane), the Order was absolutely contrary to the spirit and the habits of Jesus. It could be more justly asked whether certain of the Master's criticisms were not aimed at the refinements and exclusiveness of the Essenes.[1] Even that is not certain, especially as their communities, isolated and absorbed in their own practices, remained without much influence on the march of events. Certain Russian sects of Raskol of the more inoffensive sort[2], with their simple, courageous, and somewhat chimerical way of living, can perhaps offer a modern analogy to the ancient Essenes.

---

[1] These last (*Natural History*, V, xvii) are obviously romances. The others, those of Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, 12–13; *Apology for the Jews* (lost; a fragment is preserved in the *Preparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius, VIII, 11–12, *MG*, XXI, 641–649), and of Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, II, viii, 2 *seq.*, coll. *Ant. Jud.*, give an impression not of complete unreality, but of a biassed idealisation. The Essenes are made to put in its best light in face of the Greeks and the Romans the pacific, philanthropic and philosophic side of Judaism. In reading these passages we recall the moving descriptions of "good savages" drawn by certain authors in the eighteenth century, and even the "good and virtuous Cimmerians" of Renan. The name "Essenes" has so far defied all research.

[2] Josephus (*Bell. Jud.*, II, viii, 13) mentions a branch of the Essenes who were married, with certain restrictions which he indicates.

---

[1] *Mk.*, vii, 1–9, 17–24. "Neither could Jesus have had anything in common with the Essenes, that remarkable order of Jewish monks. If such connection had existed, Jesus would have been one of those disciples who bear witness to their dependence on their masters by preaching and doing exactly the opposite of what they have learnt from them. . . . Both end and means separate them. If in any particular precepts given to his disciples Jesus seems to be at one with the Essenes, it is through a purely fortuitous coincidence, for the motives were completely different"; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*.

[2] e.g., the *Doukhobors*. See Stamouli, *ERE*, IV, pp. 865–867. We can equally compare with the Essenes the community of the Shakers, founded in 1787 in the United States. See Bruce-Taylor, *Communistic Societies of America*, *ERE*, III, pp. 782 *seq.*

Let us come to the great parties, which were opponents and rivals on many points, but which a common interest could partially draw together and unite against Jesus: the *Sadducees* and the *Pharisees*.[1] The distant origin of these sects has been sought for in their conflicting tendencies, the one rigidly Jewish, the other more open to foreign influences, which divided the Jewish leaders throughout the period which followed the return from exile.[2]

At first the severe tendency, closed to all compromise, which was favoured by the leaders of the migration, Esdras and Nehemias, and by the fact that the greater number of the social leaders of the people had remained in Mesopotamia, undoubtedly reigned supreme. It is the period of the *Soferim*, i.e., the commentators on the book *par excellence*, the *Sefer-ha-torah* (book of the Law). Promulgated again among this group of devout Jews, the Law became truly the *form* of this people, in the Aristotelian sense of the word, the intimate regulator of its life, its specific principle of order and of hierarchy. In it was sought every rule for public and private organisation, every solution for the extremely complex cases which were raised by the return to Judaea of the caravans from Persia, coming as they were amongst a scattered population of pagan or semi-pagan occupiers. From this necessity there sprang the important occupation of the scribe, the commentator on the sole rule of God. Sprung generally from modest origins, often laymen, though not always (Esdras himself was of the sacerdotal caste), the scribes favoured with all their power whatever tended to separate Israel from the people amongst whom they lived, with the object of restoring an autonomous state. Mixed marriages, therefore, intercourse with pagans or the semi-Jews of Samaria, and anything approaching idolatry were zealously denounced.

On the other hand, some of the most important of the priests who had returned from exile, pastors and leaders of the people in this theocracy in which the two powers were confounded, remained in contact with the Persian authorities, and even went so far as to unite themselves in marriage with influential families not of pure Jewish race. Such was the case, for example, of the high priest Eliasib : he was united to the family of Tobias the Ammonite,[1] and one of his grandsons, the son of Joiadah (and therefore the son and grandson of high priests) married a daughter of Sanaballat the Horonite. And Tobias and Sanaballat, sworn enemies of Nehemias, opposed with all their might the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem undertaken by the latter.

---

[1] On these names, see below, Note J.

[2] See the careful memoir by Sieffert: *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, *REP*, XV, pp. 265 *seq.*

We can see in these two tendencies, the one aristocratic and liberal, represented by the high sacerdotal caste, and the other more humble and rigidly closed to all foreign influence, an anticipation of the future.

Yet the true origin of the parties of the Sadducees and Pharisees does not go back so far : it must be sought in the obscure period which separates the end of the era of the scribes and the death of Simon the Just from the brutal attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to hellenise the country (roughly 270-175 B.C.).[2]

Then was completely shattered the unity of the sacerdotal and learned oligarchy, the legendary " Great Synagogue " of later Jewish tradition, which maintained on the whole for two centuries, despite varying fortunes, a certain general understanding amongst those faithful to the Law. Whatever form that assembly may have had (and we must not be too quick to see in it the features of the future Sanhedrin), it united the double authority of the great priestly families and the doctors (priests or laymen) who gave the people from day to day the interpretation of the Law. The members of the first group, who were the more rigid the more liberty they took for themselves, and were satisfied with a literalism which cut short all casuistical discussion, stood theoretically, if not practically, for the written Law without gloss. The others strove to give to the sacred texts a suppleness which would enable them to be adapted to a change of circumstances; this they sought to do by the double means of a subtle exegesis of the letter of the law, and a traditional interpretation, a kind of oral law, which later took form in the Mishna. It was probably on that point that the separation took place.

---

[1] On the lineage of this Tobias the Ammonite, see *La Palestine dans les Papyrus ptolémaiques de Gerza*, by Vincent, in *RB*, 1920, pp. 187 *seq.* On the religious situation in Judaea at this time, see Touzard, *L'Ame Juive au temps des Perses*, *RB*, 1923, pp. 61 *seq.*

[2] The end of the period of the *Soferim* is ordinarily placed at the time of the death of the high priest Simon the Just, the son of Onias. But we know that this can apply either to Simon I, the son of Onias I (died about 270), or to Simon II, son of Onias II (died about 199). The first choice seems the more probable, whatever Renan may say (*Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, IV, p. 217 and n. 4), but would require a long note to justify a point which is only on the fringe of our subject, especially as " there is no other high priest around whom there has crystallised so strange a mixture of facts and of fictions, for which the Talmud, Josephus, and the *Second Book of Machabees* have supplied the material ": Sch. Ochser, art. *Simeon the Just*, in *JE*, XI, p. 352.

From whichever side the initiative came, the somewhat ill-sounding name of the *Separated* (*peruchim*, Pharisees) was applied to those who abandoned the high authorities of the Temple. Thus it was indicated that they formed a body apart and were seceders. They themselves did not call themselves by this name, but preferred that of *haberim* (colleagues, companions, fellow-workers). But the other name prevailed, and it is as Pharisees that all ancient tradition knew them. In contradistinction to them, and before political circumstances led them to reintroduce certain Pharisees into the supreme council of the nation, the representatives of the priestly caste were called or called themselves the sons of Sadoc (Sadducees), in allusion no doubt to a prince of the priests of the time of David and Solomon, Sadoc, whose real or fictitious descendents were regarded as the sacerdotal family *par excellence.*[1]

Each party was wedded to its own opinions, while the mass of the people, naturally closer to the Pharisees, oscillated between currents which sometimes came near to intermingling, only speedily to resume their separate and often antagonistic courses. Ambitious, and consequently opportunist, very tolerant in the matter of alliances, understandings, and compromises with pagans and half-Jews, devout, hard towards the poorer people, and on the one hand unscrupulously increasing their personal fortunes from the enormous contributions of money and other offerings which flowed into the Temple from all parts of the Holy Land and from the Dispersion, the Sadducees professed, on the other hand, an unswerving conservatism in matters of the law. They reduced the whole of Revelation, at least all that was of absolute authority, to the five books of Moses, rejecting or disputing, as illegitimate or imaginary, more recently developed beliefs on the resurrection of the body, the world of spirits, and the Messianic Kingdom. The Law alone, and in its strict letter, was of weight with them. It was less as priests (many of the priests were Pharisees) than as aristocrats and leaders of a dominant faction, as interpreters of Revelation and of the Law, that this minority, full of haughtiness towards the lowly, and bending only to the great, stood in opposition to the Pharisees. These men, well-born and endowed with worldly goods, looked with jealousy on the progress of a caste formed outside themselves, and criticised their adversaries as innovators and rebels. They deplored the growing prestige brought to the Pharisees by their zeal, their knowledge, and their rigorism. They found these casuists an obstacle and an embarrassment.

---

[1] On these names, see Note J, *infra.* On the basis of the whole matter, and the origin of the parties, I follow, while omitting doubtful details, the very thorough studies by Lauterbach, "The Sadducees and Pharisees", in *Studies of Jewish Literature*, London, 1913; and "Midrash and Mishnah", in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, new series, V and VI (1914–1915; 1915–1916). These views are adopted by Box, "Pharisees" *ERE*, IX, pp. 831-836, and "Sadducees", *ibid.*, XI, pp. 43–46. See also Travers Herford, *The Pharisees*, London, 1924, pp. 18–52, *Historical account of Pharisaism.*

But we should not imagine that the whole Sadducean party was of the type stigmatised by the Talmud :

> " House of Boethus ? Woe is me !
> Woe is me by reason of their bludgeons.
> House of Annas ? Woe is me !
> Woe is me by reason of their viperish hissings.
> House of Cantharos ? Woe is me !
> Woe is me by reason of their calumnies.
> House of Ismael, sons of Phabi ? Woe is me!
> Woe is me by reason of their clenched hands.

> They are high priests, their sons are treasurers, their sons-in-law are inspectors of the Temple, and their footmen belabour the people with clubs."[1]

It really seems that we must no longer judge the whole party by the radically exclusive members, and the insolently secular attitude of the families which disputed amongst themselves over the office of high priest. Scholars are inclined to see in the *Ecclesiasticus* of Jesus the son of Sirach a book that is representative of the primitive Sadducees ; from this we should have to conclude that the sect had a theology of its own, though very conservative in nature, and that it treated the prophets with honour, if it did not put them on a level with the five books of the Law.

With much more reason must we temper our judgment of the whole if we reckon as Sadducees the little party of reformers known as " the penitents of Israel, the sons of Sadoc ", whose existence has been lately revealed by a fragmentary document written before the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70, but which it is impossible to date precisely.[2] The origin of the sect would seem to have been a " revival " which took place in the sacerdotal world " three hundred and ninety years after [Jahveh] delivered [the sons of Israel] into the hands of Nabuchodonosor, King of Babylon " (I, 5), which would bring us to the year 196 B.C. About twenty years later a group of puritans seceded under the guidance of an unnamed chief, " the Master of Justice ", " the Star ", and shunning the criminal practices of the priests then charged with the services of the Temple, congregated at Damascus where they set up "the Union of Repentance". The rest of their history continues to be wrapped in impenetrable mystery.

---

[1] *Pesahim*, 57*a*. *Tosephta Menahot*, chap. XIII, end (Pasewalk, 1808,) ed Zuckermandel, p. 533.

[2] These fragments were found in the depository for old manuscripts (*genizeh*: see *JE*, V, p. 612 *seq.*) in the synagogue at Cairo, and were published by Schechter as *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, I, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Cambridge, 1910.
As regards the date of composition, Charles, interpreting " the germ of Israel and of Aaron " (1, 5) of a Messias to be born of Mariamne II and Herod the Great, i.e., between 18 and 8 B.C., gives a date as almost certain; but it remains disputed and is very doubtful (Charles in *APOT*, II, p. 785). The complete literature of the subject up to 1926 is in Frey's " *Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament* ", in *DBVS*, I, col. 402–403.

To judge by the fragments of the document which we possess, these reformers cannot be confounded either with the Sadducees who were contemporary with Christ, since, unlike these, they believed in the resurrection of the body, the existence of separate spirits, and the inspiration of the Prophets ; nor with the Pharisees, since the "Spoken Law", the oral and living commentary on the Law, was unacceptable to them. They were ardent Messianists (but this feature does not sufficiently characterise them), and scrupulous observers of the Law, excelling, it would seem, the Pharisees themselves in this respect.

As opposed to the Essenes, dreamers absorbed in moral and ritual matters, and the Sadducees, aristocrats by race and politicians by instinct, the "Companions" (*haberim*), the "Devout" (*chasidim*)—who soon came to be called the Pharisees and have remained such for us—formed a party which was before all things religious and national, a kind of Holy League, the Jewish party pure and simple. Their whole aim was in the first place to purge the people of God who had returned to the Promised Land, from foreign infiltrations and influence, and then to preserve them from the aggressive, cunning and sometimes (as in the time of the Seleucidae) violent propaganda of surrounding paganism. In this defence of the Jewish spirit and customs, the essential wall or, to use a metaphor dear to the rabbis, the protecting hedge of Jahveh's vine, was the Law of Moses. Recruited from all classes of society, including the most humble, without distinction of priests and laity, and counting among their number the majority of the intellectuals, scribes and doctors, the Pharisees were thus before all the men of the Law : its interpreters, its avengers, and at need its martyrs. St. Paul, when he wishes to express his passionate attachment to the Law, is content to say : "an Hebrew of the Hebrews. *According to the law, a Pharisee*" (*Phil.* iii, 5). In saying that he says all.

In their absolute trust in the Torah, some inclined to make it independent, to some extent, even of God. The little collection called *the Sentences of the Fathers*, which represents Pharisaism in its most authentic aspect, and gives us the best of it for the period reaching from the first century B.C. to the end of the second century A.D., practically identifies the scribe with the saint: knowledge of the Law sanctifies after the manner of a sacrament. Rabbi Meir (about 135) said: "Everyone who gives himself to the study of the Torah for its own sake is worthy of every good. What is more, the whole world and its fulness is not worth more than he".[1]

In these thoroughly religious pages God is scarcely named.[2] The Law takes up all the space, because, for a Pharisee, it virtually signifies the whole of divine truth, so far as it is accessible to the human mind.[3] And they had for it the respect that is due to God: the most innocent distraction during the study of the Torah is culpable, as being one which interrupts a prayer.

Rabbi Jacob (who died in 175) said: "He who walks about while studying (the Torah) and interrupts his study to say 'How beautiful is that tree', or 'How beautiful is that wild spot!', Scripture holds such words to be a sin which makes his soul guilty".[4]

In this way the Pharisee drew from the Law the rules for the whole conduct of his life, private and public. This last fact, which endowed the scribe with the very power of the State, was bound to lead to conflicts with the political powers.

---

[1] *Pirké Aboth*, VI, I, ed. Strack, *Die Spruche der Vaeter*, Leipzig, 1901, p. 47 And reciprocally: "no '*am-ha'arez* is *chasid*", no uneducated man, unversed in the Law, can be pious, devout, or religiously full-grown. This saying is attributed to the great Hillel, and perfectly expresses the conviction of the leaguers: *Pirké Aboth*, II, 5, in Strack; II, 6, in Travers Herford. See also the commentary in the edition by Marti, Giessen, 1927.

[2] Not only the sacred name, which excessive respect made them avoid writing down, but even its equivalents are absent. Of these equivalents, the most frequently used was *Makom*, the Place, meaning That which is everywhere present, the Omnipresent.

[3] "Torah virtually means the whole of divine truth, so far as it is accessible to human mind", Travers Herford, Preface to the *Pirké Aboth*, *APOT*, II, p. 689.

[4] *Pirké Aboth*, Strack, III, 7b, p. 30; Travers Herford, III, 10, p. 700.

And in fact neither the Hasmonaean princes from the time of John Hyrcanus, excluding the personal reign of the old Queen Alexandra (78-69 B.C.), nor the Idumæans accepted this tutelage. But whether favoured or suspected, sometimes even persecuted, the *Separated* never ceased to be feared by reason of their power with the people. This power, which Josephus states, with obvious exaggeration, to have been practically unlimited, was certainly great and often preponderant.[1] It was based in great part on the manner in which the Pharisees had decentralised and in a certain sense laicised and democratised the religion of Israel. The Temple remained its centre ; the hegemony of the great priestly families, and especially of the high priest, continued to be exercised ; but even there, in the Temple, the Pharisees had their influence, and had caused daily prayers to be established, and instituted a sort of delegation of pious laity representing the people of Israel at the daily sacrifice.[2] Outside the Temple, by means of the synagogue and worship in the home, they had severed the line which bound the whole religion of the people to the Temple. The rabbi[3] and the father of the family tended more and more to supplant the Levite and the priest. Finally, in matters casuistical and the application of the Law to daily life by means of subtle exegeses and traditional interpretation, a sort of unwritten Law[4] commenting upon the written one (spoken of above)—in these matters the Pharisees were supreme, and for an Israelite desirous of devoutly fulfilling his duties, indispensable. Women especially (as Josephus noted) looked upon them as their oracle.

---

[1] "Practically (the Sadducees) do nothing, for as soon as they have charge of anything, they follow (although only through compulsion) what the Pharisees say, for otherwise the people would not support them"; *Ant. Jud.*, XVIII, 1, 4. On the variations of Josephus in his remarks concerning the religious sects of his time, and the political causes of these variations, see Rasp, "*Flavius Josephus und die Religionsparteien*", in *ZNTW*, XXIII, pp. 27–48.

[2] See Box, *ERE*, IX, 834, and the authorities cited.

[3] On the rise of the rabbi, see the *Pirké Aboth*, VI, 5, Strack; VI, 6, Herford: "The Torah is greater than the priesthood and royalty. For royalty requires thirty qualifications, and the priesthood twenty-four, but to interpret the Torah correctly needs forty-eight."

[4] "The Law by the mouth": *torah chebeal pe*, as opposed to the written law, *torah chebiketab*; *DBH*, V, 57, S. Schechter.

Less dependent than the chosen priesthood on political vicissitudes, less entangled than the Zealots in militant xenophoby, the bulk of the Pharisees represented, from the time of the Machabees to the fall of Jerusalem, the kernel of Israel, the heart of Judaism by their ardour in observing, imposing, and explaining the Law, by their minute knowledge, which though literal and rigid was yet real, by the hold which their puritanism gave them over the people, and by the religious feeling which made them favour the more purified and spiritual doctrines.

So, too, it was through the *Separated* that the Jewish people survived the appalling catastrophes of the first and second centuries. The barriers established, or re-erected, around the race; the traditions jealously maintained within these closed groups ; the supple resistance which only gave way in order to obtain ; the political opportunism which bowed to every *de facto* government to snatch from each of them toleration and the maximum of possible concessions ; the enormous mass of sayings, prescriptions, decisions, and recollections which crystallised into the two Talmuds : all these are the work of the Pharisees. And it is sufficient to read the Gospels to see the preponderant part played by them in the opposition encountered by Christ.

This very opposition makes impartiality more difficult for the Christian historian towards the principal enemies of Jesus. But he himself has plainly taught us that truth alone delivers. And while proving that they became by their blind obstinacy and the malice of their leaders the enemies of the Kingdom of God, we willingly acknowledge that the Pharisees played a useful and sometimes a glorious part during the century and a half which preceded our era. Those who spied upon Jesus were the petty descendants, buried in the formalism of the Law, and sometimes poisoned by sterile pride, of the great men who had freed Israel from the yoke of the Gentiles at the price of their blood. All that was best in the literature which preceded the advent of Christ bore as a rule the imprint of the beliefs, the hopes, and the passions which were theirs.

And even in the time of the Saviour, if many were but the vinegar of a generous wine, the remnants of a heroic race, yet an impressive minority did not sin against the light.[1] In this matter the *Acts of the Apostles* are very helpful in completing the testimony borne by the Gospels. They show us in the youthful Church a great number of recruits from the party of the Pharisees; beginning with St. Paul, they were not the most unimportant.[2]

In conclusion we must note that, while stigmatizing their merciless literalism, their complacent casuistry and their pride, Jesus aimed much more at the vices of conduct, the abuse of holy things, the canonization of human tradition, the ill-inspired zeal of the *Separated*, than at their doctrinal position. On the characteristic questions of the resurrection of the body, the existence and the action of spiritual forces, the Master was in agreement with them. Nor did he disdain to employ (though moderately) their exegetical methods. He acknowledged their relative authority in the domain of the interpretation of the Law: "The Scribes and Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All things therefore whatsoever they say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not" (*Mt.* xxiii, 2-3).

---

[1] If we seek in history a term of comparison for the influence of the Pharisees, we may perhaps find it best in the preponderant part played in China by the learned Chinese Confucians under the Manchu dynasty of the T'sing (1644–1911). With them we see again, together with the obstinate following of plans and the *odi profanum vulgus* attitude, a doctrine of textual interpretation whose possession is considered sufficient for all purposes, and opens the way to all power. But their corruption and materialist positivism places them far below the *Separated*, Cf. Wieger, *Histoire des Croyances religieuses et des opinions philosophiques en Chine*. 1922, pp. 561 *seq.*, 679 *seq.*, 715 *seq.*, "The learned ones of the New School, of which Chou Hi (who died in 1200) was the soul, called themselves the School of the Way, the Wise Men, and treated their opponents as *Little Folk*", p. 667.

[2] Johannes Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 59, finds "this feature very improbable". It is so only for those who identify the whole mass of devout Israel with those "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" who were denounced by Jesus.

## III. THE INTELLECTUAL SETTING

### A. *The Sources*

In the people of Galilee and Judaea where the influence of these parties prevailed in varying degrees, from the cowardly wisdom of the Herodians to the intractability of the Zealots, what thoughts, what religious aspirations had the preaching of the Nazarene Master to encounter and to transform? To reply even summarily to this question, it is necessary to review some of the sources of our knowledge on this subject.

Let us recall to our memory, while insisting on their primary influence, the books of the Old Testament, not only those which contained the Law, but the historical books, the Prophets, and what is called the Sapiential or wisdom literature, especially the Psalms. We have not here to pronounce judgment on the dates of their composition and the other literary questions raised by these books. It is sufficient to note that in the time of Christ the education of every Israelite, both in Palestine and in the Dispersion, was based on the study of these books, and often ended there. Even that is saying too little; for they were, through oral teaching, familiar even to those of the Jews who, for want of instruction, remained unlettered. The works of the Alexandrian Philo, a contemporary of Christ, which have in large part been preserved for us, enlighten us on the manner in which the more instructed Israelites of the Dispersion, and those whom we might call the most liberal, in the modern sense of the word, understood the Scriptures and based on them their whole conception of life. The various histories and apologies of the historian Flavius Josephus, whose birth at Jerusalem almost coincided with the conversion of St. Paul, are equally full of valuable information, which, however, we must be careful to accept only with reserve.

Side by side with these sources, which are well known and have long been utilised, an ample though almost entirely anonymous literature stretches over the three centuries which formed the most agitated and the most important period of Judaism, viz., from the time of the Machabees (170 B.C.) to the final ruin by Hadrian (A.D. 130). Of Palestinian origin (and written in the Semitic tongue) or exotic in origin (and written in Greek), this series of works has generally come down to us through later translations, or in a fragmentary state.[1] For the last twenty years it has been possible to read it consecutively in critical editions.

Apart from the works of historians, or edifying tales in historical form, we find there moral books, sententious, poetic, and highly-coloured, exploiting the resources of parallelism and rhythm. The great historic figures of David and (especially) Solomon dominate this type of literature, for which several of our inspired books of the last period have supplied the models.

So, too, it is with the Bible that we must connect the collections of sentences and of decisions which have been finally gathered into the Talmud, and of which a portion goes back to the time of Christ and even to the generations just before him, as well as the prayers which have remained traditional in Israel.[2] There is no need to stress the importance of these sources for the end we have in view.

Hardly less important is the apocalyptic literature, which though considerable in extent is strange and more unusual in form. Its origins are distant, since considerable portions of the first prophets (*Isaias*, *Ezechiel*, etc.) belong to this type. But amongst the canonical books it is the prophecy of *Daniel* which gives, in the greater part of its contents, the purest and most perfect type of it. Brought into fashion in the time of the captivity of Israel amongst the Medes and Persians, and dependent for a great part of its imagery on Babylonian and Iranian sources, the apocalypse was the literary type which was most cultivated in Israel during the centuries which preceded Christ, and of that which followed his advent. As we shall see, Jesus himself did not disdain to employ it.

---

[1] In the Bibliography below (pp. 306–7) will be seen the modern corpus in which this scattered matter has been united.

[2] Stapfer (*La Palestine au temps de Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1892, p. 24 *seq.*) passes perhaps too severe a judgment on " these interminable pages " in which there is " neither style, nor order, nor talent ", and in which " the language is as deplorable as the thought and the form on which it is based ". The exegetical utility of the Talmuds is vividly shown, with some partiality, by Abrahams in " Rabbinical Aids to Exegesis ", in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, London, 1909, pp. 159–193; and more completely in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, I, Cambridge, 1917, II, Cambridge, 1924; also *KTM*.

The finest texts are found in the most ancient treatise of the Mishna, entitled: *The Sayings of the Fathers* (*Pirké Aboth*). It has often been separately edited, notably by Strack, *Pirké Aboth*, Leipzig, 1901, and by Marti, Giessen, 1927. The text of the *Eighteen Benedictions* (*Shemone Esre*) which every Israelite, including women, children and slaves, had to repeat three times a day, and which goes back in its original form (in nineteen benedictions) to the times which immediately followed the sack of Jerusalem in 70, has often been published, notably by Dalman, along with other Messianic texts as an appendix to his *Worte Jesu*, Leipzig 1898, pp. 292–309, and after him by Lagrange, *Messianisme*, pp. 338–339.

This fact of itself would prevent us from absolutely decrying it. But we have to admit that the apocalyptic method astonishes, and sometimes shocks, our customary ways of thinking and speaking. In essence an apocalypse[1] is a divine revelation (or is thought to be such) of distant, future events, which are naturally hidden, and especially of final things : the end of a state of affairs, of an empire, of a world (in the widest extent, the end of things, the end of the world ; the judgment of a people, and a decisive crisis in its history), ultimately, the last judgment, the final crisis in human history, the rewards and the punishments beyond the tomb.

From this character and, no doubt, from its first models, flow quite naturally the laws of this type of literature, as also the fact that an apocalypse, written in cold blood, artificially, and not based on real visions, is generally anonymous. To give authority to these visions (which are only a kind of prevision) their authors desire, and are almost compelled, to place them under the protection of a great name, such as Henoch, Moses, Esdras, Elias, and even Adam. An apocalypse is necessarily rich in imagery, in allegories, and in symbols ; and if they have a religious or political purpose, so that they contain allusions to contemporary facts and persons (which frequently happens and enables us to date certain pieces with more or less certainty), this is done in an ambiguous, obscure manner, intended to arouse curiosity.

---

[1] Ἀποκάλυψις, *revelatio*; active revelation, (concerning the fact of a supernatural communication), and passive, (formulating the fruit, the object of that communication.)

As is the case with the mystics, and for analogous reasons, the first apocalyptic writers despaired of attaining to language worthy of the great and terrible realities with which their visions had brought them in contact ; but they did attempt it : and their expressions are therefore vehement to hyperbole, grandiose even to incoherence, and bold to the extent of being impossible. And when this type of writing was prolonged and perpetuated, certain comparisons quickly became fixed as *clichés*, arranged in ready-made series.

And since heavenly disturbances and cosmic upheavals were thought suitable for suggesting feelings of terror, the whole heavenly machine was brought into use in announcing events which thus seem " to reach even to the stars " and to connect with the final convulsions of the world.

Similarly forces let loose which carry out divine vengeance, empires, invasions, natural disasters, angelic or elemental powers, are ordinarily described under animal forms which are partly suggested by the cyclopean art of the Egyptians and Assyrians. Various beasts, real or invented, strange and formidable of aspect, appear, make progress, battle, triumph or die, and their fate represents that of men, peoples and eras fixed by providence.

This literature is particularly suited to times of crisis : perhaps that is one of the reasons for its enduring and constant success, for to Jewish apocalypses succeeded Christian literature of the same type (though more sober), of which the last and supreme fruit was the *Divine Comedy* of the " *altissimo poeta* ". An unfortunate war, or a revolution, gives rise, even in our own times, to prophecies which are in direct descent from the apocalypses.[1]

It is sufficiently plain that reserve is needed in the use of such sources, and that precautions must be observed by any historian desiring to profit by them. But it would be a worse evil to neglect them absolutely, the more so as the greater part of the documents of Jewish origin contemporary with, slightly previous to, and slightly later than the advent of Christ are drawn up in the apocalyptic style. We shall accordingly make use of them in the exposition which is to follow; for that pseudonymous, allegorical, and half esoteric literature contains, amongst all the poverty, sterility and banalities which make its study terribly wearisome, a certain expansion and growth in doctrine from ancient prophecy. Certain ideas became crystallized at this period which the thrice-unworthy heirs of an Ezechiel, an Isaias, and a Daniel, have transmitted to us, just as a fall of coarse volcanic rocks brings down with it a few valuable stones. The universality of the divine call, certain features of the Messias, the immeasureable value of the human soul, the certainty, duration, and some of the conditions of punishment beyond the tomb, and the ministering care of spirits:[1] all these appear to us more clearly in these works. Otherwise the Jewish apocalypses have scarcely done more than take up the old themes, clothing them, and sometimes disfiguring them, with gaudy imagery, or entangling them in obscure symbols. Far from being as a whole a happy link between the Prophets and the Gospel, the apocalypses were rather a parenthesis, and it is by passing over them that the words of the Master join on to, prolong, and complete the teachings of the great seers of old.

---

[1] E.g. Yves de la Brière, *Le Destin de l'Empire allemand et les oracles prophétiques*, Paris, 1916. [Cf. the British-Israelite and Great-Pyramid literature. Tr.]

### B. *The Dominant Ideas*

It is a delicate task[2] to make real to ourselves the state of mind of Jesus's hearers on the essential points of his teaching, by using these various sources of information, of which the Gospels, from the merely historical point of view, are certainly the purest. It is as difficult as it is to discover from either earlier or contemporary documents the aspirations, the dominant ideas, the prevailing influences, or the currents of feeling at work in French society on the eve of the meeting of the States General of 1789, or in German society in 1813 when Fichte published his *Discourses* and J. J. Görres galvanised it by his pamphlets ; or at the present day in the India of Rabindranath Tagore and Mahatma Gandhi.

---

[1] And, we must admit, a thousand tortuous fantasies probably inspired by Iranian tradition.

[2] The instruments at our service in the matter cannot be used without precautions. Not only the works of Weber and even of Schürer, but the more recent researches of Walker (*The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age*, London, 1923), and the admirably conscientious gleanings of Strack and Billerbeck in their vast *KTM*, can lead into error those who would use them without noting that a large proportion of the sources cited are, at least in their editing,

Of these ideas, the most effective and most universally disseminated (although its potential riches were as yet undeveloped) was that which Jesus was to adopt as the vehicle of his message while he gave it a more determined and partly novel meaning : that of the Kingdom of God.[1] The Bible proclaims over and over again[2] that Jahveh is the King, i.e., the Master, the Judge, the Sovereign of his people Israel, and virtually of all peoples. Yet the gospel form of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is not to be found in any ancient prophet, nor even at all, with one doubtful exception, in the Old Testament.[3]

---

and their spirit, some also in the facts reported, later than the Gospels by several centuries. Some have even been obviously influenced by them. The very efficient studies of Abrahams (*Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1917 and 1924) do not completely escape this reproach, and, much less, those of C. G. Montefiore, e.g., in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. I, and *The Old Testament, and After*, London, 1923.

[1] Or, in the same sense, but passing from the personal to the territorial aspect, for the Kingdom of God we may say the Kingdom of Heaven, " Heaven " being here a respectful synonym for the Lord Jahveh. See Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, I, p. 75.

[2] The chief texts are collected and commented upon by Père Lagrange in "*Le Régne de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament*", *RB*, 1908, pp. 36–61 ; and Böhmer, *Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes*, Leipzig, 1902. See the same author on the equivalent ideas amongst other ancient nations: *Der religiongeschichtliche Rahmen des Reiches Gottes*, Leipzig, 1909.

[3] *Daniel* ii, 44 is the pasage which most nearly approaches the Gospel meaning. The expression βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is found textually in the panegyric which the book of *Wisdom* devotes to Jacob (X, 10):

> " The just when he fled from his brother's wrath
> She (Wisdom) conducted through the right ways.
> She showed him *the kingdom of God*
> And gave him the knowledge of the holy things."

Cornely and Zorell, in their Commentary (Paris, 1910, p. 387), interpret the

Its meaning, which will be explained further on, exceeds that given to it in the apocryphal books which are earlier than Christ in which the *βασιλεία Θεοῦ* occupies on the whole little space.[1] It is even greater than that given to it by the later rabbis.[2] But the general idea which it expresses is implied clearly in the hope of Israel, of which it is, in truth, the very soul. In actual fact it is not, as a modern would be tempted to suppose, an idea of natural religion—(although connected with it in fact) the divine omnipotence, allotting God and man to their respective places, from which one is normally led to the idea of the total sovereignty of God over man. As a positive and revealed article of faith, its object is the more and more effective and perfect realisation of the gracious design of God with regard to a man, a group of men, and virtually, in certain conditions, to all men.

Its historic origin is the Covenant, the *Berith*,[3] the Alliance which, by uniting Jahveh with Abraham and his family, and then with the people sprung from him, made of this people the chosen race, " servants of God ", " wedded to God ", to adopt the magnificent phrases of the prophets,[4] and bound

---

" Kingdom of God " of Providence or even of the divine majesty. Père Lagrange, in " *Le Livre de la Sagesse* " in *RB*, 1907, pp. 102 *seq.*, following Cornelius a Lapide, whom he cites, also understands it of Providence. Böhmer says " We have the sense of the text (*Wisdom*, x, 10) perfectly when we take the expression *βασιλεία Θεοῦ* as a paraphrase for " God who reigns over all ": *Der religionsgeschichtliche Rahmen des Reiches Gottes*, p. 33.

[1] Cf. *Ibid.* Böhmer, *Der religionsgeschichtliche Rahmen* etc., pp. 21–56.

[2] Despite what has been said by Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, Tübingen, 1903, p. 299. See also Böhmer, *Ibid.*, pp. 56–84, and J. Bonsirven, *Eschatologie rabbinique d'après Targums, Talmuds, Midrashs*, Rome, 1910, pp. 350–365. Cf. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 113.

[3] On the *Berith*, its origin and meaning, see Paul Karge: *Geschichte des Bundesgedankes im alten Testament*, Münster i.W., 1910, I, especially p. 224 *seq.* Nowhere perhaps is the Alliance set out with greater force and profundity, from its patriarchal origins to the dawn of the return of Israel to Palestine, than in the magnificent prophecies of the second part of the book of *Isaias* ch. xl to lv. See for example the *résumé* by J. Touzard: " *L'Ame Juive au temps des Perses* ", in *RB*, 1920, p. 18 *seq.*

[4] *Isaias*, liv, 5; *Osee*, ii, 19.

the religious fate of humanity to the history of this people.[1] In this alliance, the human party to it, which was always unequal to its vocation, sometimes showed itself utterly unworthy. Its infidelities, its adulterous worship of false gods, and its recourse to the powers of the flesh, brought about six centuries of derelictions, punishments, and temporary repudiations by Jahveh. To the exiles, to the mass transportations into the distant lands of Babylonia and Persia, there succeeded (after the tyranny of the Seleucidæ and the Machabean recovery) the attack of the Gentiles on the land, the institutions, and the independence of Israel. But Jahveh, who is just, is also merciful, and the pact concluded by him with Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, renewed with David and his house, and ratified by the oracles and the promises made to the prophets, was to be unrevoked (as the divine promise guaranteed).

Then shall Jahveh reign: his rule shall be recognised. By right his glory extends as far as his dominions in heaven and earth, over men and over the beasts of the field. And in fact, also, the day will come when it will be acknowledged by all.

Yes, Jahveh's time will come! The troubled days of the present are giving birth to better days when, everything being ordered and in its proper place, peace, prosperity, and the reign of right shall succeed to humiliations, injustices, and ruin: *veniet felicior aetas*. That will be, not that "present wicked" era of which St. Paul speaks (*Gal.* i, 4), but the "future time" of which the other is only the unhappy and derisive shadow. And in this joyful revolution the essential features of which are conceived and ordered differently by each author, Israel will hold the first place: she will be the means employed in bringing it about, and even more certainly it will be she who will benefit by it. Before all the nations which now disdain and persecute her, she will be glorified for ever. The poems in the last chapters of the Book of Isaias express these hopes in unforgettable phrases, and foretell in sublime terms all her vengeance and her joys.

---

[1] Israel, if it is faithful to the Covenant, will itself become the link between Jahveh and other nations; it will be their ideal, their prototype, their light. It will be the "alliance of the people". *Isaias*, xlii, 6; xlix, 8; cf. *Jeremias* xxxi, 31–33, and Touzard, *loc. laud.*, p. 34, note 8.

That is why the Lord Jahveh has said :
Behold, my servants shall eat,
 and you shall be hungry ;
Behold, my servants shall drink,
 and you shall be thirsty ;
Behold, my servants shall rejoice,
 and you shall be confounded.
Behold, for joyfulness of heart, my servants shall sing,
 and you, for sorrow of heart, shall groan,
 and in despair shall you lament !

For behold I create new heavens,
 and a new earth.
The past shall no more be remembered,
 it shall come no more upon the heart.
But you shall taste the joy and the eternal gladness
 of what I shall create :
For behold, I create Jerusalem (for) rejoicing,
 and its people (for) joy.
Jerusalem shall be my pleasure,
 and its people my joy.

For they shall be a race blessed by Jahveh,
 and their posterity with them.
And before they call me, I will hearken to them :
 while they are yet speaking they shall be heard.[1]

But this prophecy, which sums up also the others, and which God was to realise by a reversal of human ideas (itself also foretold)[2] remained obscured by images and symbols. Unanimous in their hopes, the thinkers, the faithful, and the enthusiastic seers did not content themselves with collecting the scattered indications in the inspired books, and commenting upon them. They added to them what was suggested by later tradition, by doubtful infiltrations, and by overheated imagination. From all these they formed more or less coherent pictures, coloured by the agony and the needs of each generation, and charged with the characteristics which were the heritage of each school.

---

[1] *Isaias* lxv, 13–15, 17–19, 23–25. Cf. Condamin, S.J., *Le Livre d'Isaie*, Paris, 1905.
[2] P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie* . . . p. 302. See below, p. 291.

On the date and the general nature of the " future time ", two currents of interpretation are visible in the apocalypses. Some authors put in the foreground the religious and moral side of God's judgment which will concern all. The complementary idea of individual retribution and the restoration of the theocracy received an importance from the serener Machabean period which marks it out in some of the apocryphal writings. The Kingdom of God is for these in the last resort the triumph of justice, the great assize at which each man will receive his sentence and will be treated on his merits : merits of all sorts, moral and especially legal, fidelity to the Law being considered the first of all duties. And thus certainly every Israelite (and those of the Dispersion did not hesitate to account as Israelites the great seers, the sages and the prophets, from Orpheus to Sophocles and from Euripides to Plato) and probably every human being, will receive his due.

But exalted as these views were, despite the bizarre trappings with which they were often decked, other aspirations ordinarily took precedence of them. Misusing the visions of material prosperity which were indispensable to a people who were " uncircumcised and hard of heart ", and as such employed by the ancient prophets, many Jews looked no further. Thus before the final judgment there was to be a period of variable length, but generally considered very long, on which the imagination loved to dwell. The error did not lie in distinguishing a terrible consummation and a period of more or less glorious, although earthly, expansion in the coming of the Kingdom of God ; it lay in the exclusively or principally carnal nature given to this period. The letter stifled the spirit; present evils by contrast excited in the imagination sensible, tangible benefits, revenge stripped of nobility. In a renewed, plentifully supplied land, a paradise, Israel triumphant would be happy, served by the nations for a period of forty, four hundred, or a thousand years. Under a council of wise men, or more frequently under a king, the lieutenant of Jahveh, Jerusalem would draw all to her.

> And the Lord of Hosts shall make
> unto all people, in this mountain,
> A feast of fat things, a feast of wine,
> of fat things full of marrow, of wine purified from the lees.[1]

Generally this apotheosis and the final judgment was thought of as preceded by wars, plagues, and signs of all sorts, as a comparison for which the pains of childbirth suggested themselves. Out of this bloody dawn there would issue, at a time very diversely assigned, the "day of the Lord", the great day. Each writer describes this last act in his own way; Henoch (c. 3) sees such a bath of blood "that a horse sinks in it up to its breast".[2] More impressive is the picture of the judgment in the apocalypse of Esdras, by its very emptiness, its implacable elimination of every human element.[3]

> No more is there a sun, nor moon, nor stars,
> No more are there clouds, no more thunder, no more lightning,
> There is no more wind, nor water, nor air,
> No more are there shadows, no more morning or evening, no more summer, nor spring, nor winter,
> No more is there ice, or cold, or hail, or rain, or dew,
> No more is there midday, no more night nor dawn, no brightness nor light.

---

[1] Isaias xxv, 6.

[2] *Henoch*, c. 3, Flemming and Radermacher, *CB*, p. 132.

[3] Violet, *CB*, pp. 148–150, lat, VII, pp. 39–41. The passage is missing from our Vulgate editions of *IV Esdras*.

> But only the splendour of the glory of the Most High
> In the light of which all shall see what shall be set before
> their eyes.

What will be the chief instrument of these great events? Jahveh had always acted through the intermediary of the prophets, the judges, the leaders raised up by him, " men on his right hand ". Nor do the sacred books, under various forms, leave any doubt on this point. Israel and the world would owe, after God and through him, their salvation and their consummation to a chosen one, a divine messenger, a great prophet consecrated for this *rôle* by an anointing analogous to that received by kings and priests ; in a word, to a Messias (*machiah ;* Aramaic, *mechiah* ; Greek, χριστός ; Latin, *unctus*; anointed, consecrated).[1] It is to him that there were lifted up in times of national trial, and when the courage of inviduals wavered under the weight of injustice, the eyes and the prayers of Israel. [2] But this hope (which was so general in the first century that pagan writers like Tacitus and Suetonius [3] when speaking of the Jews, make it one of their received beliefs) took very diverse forms. In writings like those of Philo, in which the Jewish religion appears clothed in Hellenic ideas, and in those of Josephus, in which a tactful treatment is evidently demanded in order to avoid bewildering the Roman conqueror, and to win him over—in these the picture of the Messias is vague, and elusive. Here and there, however, and despite them, the expectation of Israel betrays itself in these writers, although the Alexandrian Jew pretends to rely chiefly on the Law to bring about the unity of the world, and on the influence of the sages to make justice reign therein. Josephus, on his part, with the impudence of a courtier who has much for which to seek pardon, transfers the Messianic promises to the race of the Flavii, a flattery which Tacitus receives for what it is worth. But these are exceptions. The facts alone would be sufficient to show this ; the truly national and popular literature, especially that of Palestine, to which, on this point the Gospels are an echo, prove it abundantly. Therein, as in the heart of every faithful Israelite (the small amount of originality in the apocalypses sufficiently guarantees it for us) the Messias occupies generally a prominent place,[1] often a preponderant one, and the idea into which he is developed dominates and colours even that of the Kingdom of God.

---

[1] On the word and its use in Jewish literature, see Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* p. 237 *seq.*

[2] Following Baldensperger and Charles, Père Lagrange has brought together the essential ideas in his fine book: *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, 150 *avant Jésus-Christ, à* 200 *après Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1909. The examination made by Volz in his *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, pp. 190–237, is also very conscientious.

[3] Tacitus, *Historiae*, V, 13; Suetonius, *Vespasian*, IV. The texts are classical, and so similar in their foundation and form (" *Judaea profecti rerum potirentur*") that a common origin (Josephus) is probable?)

He is the Great Expected, the Desired, he who is to restore all things : in the books written at the climax of the Machabæan period[2] he is seen rather in the prolongation of the sacerdotal[3] and royal race " through which salvation has reached Israel ". He comes, indeed, to complete the work of Judas Machabæus, of his brother Simon, and of John Hyrcanus. And while rounding it off, he leads it to its ultimate consequences, and in some respects he overlaps and goes beyond it. These additional features become accentuated in later writers, at a time when the hope of a human solution grows less. While he is always the judge in those writings in which attention is chiefly given to the end of the world,[4] and the warrior king in those in which the character of temporal triumph is most marked,[5] he is always both the one and the other, and, as such, the liberator, the saviour, the restorer and the redresser of wrongs. The noblest expression of this expectation is to be found undoubtedly in the seventeenth of what are called the *Psalms of Solomon.*[1] Therein is sketched with wonderful delicacy of touch and by a man who possibly, in the extreme evening of his life, may have seen with his own eyes " the Salvation of Israel ", the picture which delighted the pious souls of true believers, Simeon and Anna, Zacharias and Elizabeth, Nathanial and Philip. It is moreover (and on this score also the passage is worthy of quotation) a very faithful echo of the ancient prophecies.

---

[1] On the few apocalyptic descriptions of the end of the world (the chief one is in the first part of the book of *Henoch*, i–xxxvi) in which the Messias does not appear, see Lagrange: *Le Messianisme*, pp. 60–65.

[2] The *Jubilees*, the Jewish version of the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, before the Christian interpolations were made; possibly the chapters lxxxiii–xc inclusive of the *Book of Henoch:* and the most ancient parts of the *Sybilline Oracles*, in general (excepting later interpolations), III, 573–808.

[3] No doubt that is why the Messias is presented in the *Testaments* as having to belong not to the tribe of Juda, but to that of Levi. See Charles, *Testaments*, pp. xlvii–xlviii.

[4] Parables of the book of *Henoch*, chs. xxxvii–lxxi inclusive.

[5] *The Assumption of Moses; The Apocalypse of Baruch.*

Behold, O Lord, and raise up for them their King, the son of David,
in the time which thou knowest, thou, O God,
that he may reign over Israel thy servant,
and gird him with strength to shatter unjust princes.

Cleanse Jerusalem from the gentiles who throng it . . .
let him destroy the impious gentiles
with a word of his mouth,
before his threat let the gentiles
flee far from his countenance . . .

Then shall he gather together the holy people
whom he shall lead with justice ;
he shall govern the tribes of the nation sanctified
by the Lord his God ;
he shall not allow iniquity to dwell any longer amongst them,
and no man knowing evil shall live with them ; . . .

---

[1] This little collection of eighteen poems, written after the manner of the Psalms by certain devout Pharisees, probably between 63 and 48 B.C., though not free from all artificiality, remains the most touching document of Jewish piety at this time.

And he shall have the gentile peoples to serve him under his yoke :
he shall glorify the Lord in the sight of the whole world ;
he shall purify Jerusalem for sanctification
as it was of old,
so that the Nations shall come from the ends of the earth
to contemplate his glory with him,
bringing as an offering their sons with them . . .

For he is a just King, instructed by God, placed over them ;
and there is no inquity, during his days in the midst of them ;
for all are holy and their King is the Lord Christ . . .

He shall not weaken during his time, leaning upon his God,
for God has made him powerful by the Holy Spirit
and wise by the gift of enlightened counsel,
accompanied with strength and justice . . .

Such is the majesty of the King of Israel whom God foresaw
in his plan to raise him up over the house of Israel,
for its correction . . .
Happy those who shall live in those days to behold
the joy of Israel in the reunion of the tribes !
May God perform it ![1]

Judge of men, liberating King of Israel, Prophet teaching the holy ways of Jahveh : apart from these almost constant characteristics, the picture drawn of the Messias is changeable and various, most frequently reaching either the chimerical or the material. Amongst the ancient prophecies everyone chooses and interprets according to his own tastes, in the measure of his soul.

---

[1] *Psalms of Solomon*, XVII, 23–51 ; cf. J. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, Paris, 1911, pp. 351–369.

But there is in the second part of the book of the prophecies of Isaias and in other prophecies[1] one sharply defined feature, which neither the most illustrious rabbis, nor the apocalyptic seers, nor the psalmists knew or wished to discover. The austere figure of the "Servant of Jahveh", of the suffering and redeeming Messias, remained in shadow, an enigma to eyes not fully opened, a scandal to minds still carnal. "Of a suffering Messias, the sources of Jewish theology previous to Christianity seem to have known nothing".[2] In order to reveal the meaning of the ancient prophecies it was necessary for the Lamb of God to come and to take upon himself and to redeem the sins of the world.

---

[1] On these prophecies see the very fine dissertation by Condamin, "*Le Serviteur de Jahveh*", in *Le Livre d'Isaie*, pp. 318–345; and by the same author the note on *Zach.* xii, 10, in *RSR*, January, 1910; also van Hoonacker, *RB*, 1909, pp. 497–518; and Touzard, *RB*, 1920, pp. 36–42.

[2] "*Von einem leidenden Messias scheinen die vorchristlichen Quellen der jüdischen Theologie nichts zu wissen*"; *Bertholet, Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, beg. von B. Stade, Tübingen, 1911, II, p. 450. To the same effect, Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 22–23; Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 75 *seq.*; Buttenwieser, art. "Messiah" in *JE*, VIII, pp. 505, 507, 510–511. A passage in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (1st century B.C.), *Benjamin*, 3, 8, in its simplest form, and apparently free from Christian interpolation, makes Jacob say when embracing Benjamin: "In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven, which says that the blameless one shall be defiled for lawless men, the sinless one shall die for ungodly men": Charles, *APOT*, II, p. 356. Dix sees therein an allusion to the prophecies of the Servant of Jahveh in the Book of *Isaias*, and to *Zach.*, xii, 9 *seq.* For the rest he acknowledges that the author does not see a Messias in this "innocent": cf. "The Messiah ben Joseph", in *JTS*, XXVII, p. 135.

Even after the coming of Jesus, and "taken as a whole, Rabbinical Judaism shut its eyes to the texts which foretold the sufferings of the Messias": Lagrange, *Le Messianisme*, p. 239. On the ideas of a suffering Messias, a son of David, and of a dying Messias, the "Messias of war", the son of Joseph (or of Ephraim), which came to light here and there amongst the ancient rabbis from the middle of the second century A.D., without reaching the stage of forming a body in even the least degree firm and coherent, see Dalman, *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias der Synagogue*, Berlin, 1888; Klausner, *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen des Judischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten*, Cracow, 1903; Dix, "The Messiah ben Joseph", *JTS*, XXVII, pp. 130–144; and especially *KTM*, II, pp. 273–299, coll. pp. 363–370, in which the question is thoroughly studied. Looking at the matter as a whole, says Dalman, "Judaism of every period has protested against

## IV. THE RELIGIOUS SETTING AND FOREIGN INFILTRATIONS

Brought in contact on such a large scale and in so permanent a manner with gentile thought and worship, exiled with the children of Israel in the heart of pagan lands, there surrounded by Hellenism and, from about 60 B.C., by the Roman State, it was inevitable that the Jewish religion should feel the effects of these influences. The effect was naturally strongest amongst the communities of the Dispersion ; but even in Palestine the traditions, the impressions brought from the great Captivity, the Syro-Grecian domination of Macedonian princes helped by local co-operation, the inevitable contact with neighbouring peoples, with Roman officials and soldiers, and with the distant brethren who had remained in Mesopotamia or had dispersed to the four winds—all this must lead, it would seem, to profound pagan infiltrations. Besides, the well-known plasticity of the Jewish character would tend to enlarge the foreign element in the thought and the religious aspirations of the time.

But in fact this expectation is somewhat disappointed. Neither in the Holy Land nor amongst the dispersed was the influence exercised by the ancient religions of Persia, Egypt and Chaldea, or by the new oriental religions, considerable ; and what there was grew less and less. One would expect to find a syncretism, a confused mixture of elements of diverse origin more or less reduced to unity by the dominating worship of Jahveh and respect for the Law. But on the contrary we find a Judaism tolerably pure and more and more intransigent, thanks, no doubt, to the vigour of its religious life, and especially it would seem, to the movements of recoil, of reaction, which

---

the idea. Hilkia called those ' fools and liars, who say of God that he has a Son and that he allowed him to be put to death '. How should God, who would not allow the immolation of Isaac, ' have permitted his own Son to be put to death, without destroying the whole world, and reducing it to a state of chaos? ' ": Dalman, *Jesus-Jeschua*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 157, quoting *Agad*, *Ber.*, 69, and Bacher: *Agada der pal. Amoraeer*, III, p. 690. The fact is so constant that it is used as a criterion by which to judge whether a writing is previous to or later than Christianity.

reunited the faithful servants of Jahveh in compact bodies at two critical periods : after the return from exile in the fifth century B.C., and after the persecution by the Seleucidæ at the end of the second. This latter, which is better known to us in its detail, shows us on the one hand the success of the Hasmonean dynasty, and on the other the organization by the Pharisees of the cabal of the devout, pushing to the limits of popular endurance this tendency towards concentration. Israel then recovered and made headway against foreigners on all sides. Not only did the religion of Jahveh remain unchanged in its essential features, but what it permitted itself to borrow, in that period when the Israel of God was no longer distinguishable from the Israel of the flesh, resembled (though less hardy and less free) what Christianity was to take later from the cults which surrounded it. A new spirit vivified and transformed these annexations.[1]

It was naturally among the Dispersed, and especially at Alexandria, that Hellenistic culture and possibly, to a small extent, some of the more outstanding ideas of ancient Egyptian religion had most influence on Jewish religious thought. Egypt had always taken, and sometimes claimed, a certain liberty in regard to the official Judaism of the Holy City. We have already mentioned the unlawful though not schismatic temples of Elephantine and Leontopolis. The Jews of Elephantine did not scruple (as is shown by the documents which have been discovered) to unite with the Holy Name those of other divinities.[2] Later on at Alexandria, the Dispersed, speaking Greek, in unceasing contact with Greek philosophers, poets, and scholars, hellenized themselves to a certain extent. We may recall the Jews expelled from Spain by Ferdinand and Isabella and transporting to Salonica and to the Near East, a Spanish and even *Romancero* dialect !

---

[1] On that see Bertholet, *Theologie des A.T.*, pp. 358, 359, in which he sums up his book: *Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Spaetjudentums*, 1909; cf. the fine studies by Touzard on "*L'Ame juive au temps des Perses*," in *RB* of 1916–1926.

[2] Van Hoonacker, *Une Communauté Judéo-Araméenne à Elephantine aux VIe et Ve siècles . . .*, Schweich Lectures, 1914, London, 1915; and Fries, *Iahvetempel ausserhalb Palästinas*, in *Beitraege zur Religionswissenschaft* (Stockholm), I, pp. 143–165.

It is true that one canonical book written in Greek, the so-called *Wisdom* of Solomon, bears traces of " numerous and characteristic Hellenistic influences " ; but we must not misunderstand this. " Underneath the Platonic and Stoic vocabulary, we find Jewish doctrine, more conscious and more sharply defined ".[1] And this remark can be applied in varying degrees to other works which witness to the penetration of foreign ideas into the circle of the Dispersed. It is the language that is influenced ; there are certain seeds sown in the ancient Books which blossom out on contact with analogous ideas met with in the worship or the philosophy of the ancients. Philo himself, the most hellenizing of all the Jewish writers known to us, " enough of a philosopher to appear in Arnim's collection amongst the sources for the Stoics ", and on whom M. Bréhier has written a book " viewing him only in his relations with the Greco-Roman world "—even he remained " a rabbi to his very marrow . . . a Jew before all else . . . more desirous of displaying his knowledge of philosophy than of seriously engaging in scientific research, and employing pagan terms from time to time in order to show that he has read the poets, and that his mystical teaching is far superior to their fantasies . . . yet he is always polite, as is fitting with a Jew in the very bosom of Hellenism, the charm of which he does not appreciate, though he fears its contempt ".[2]

---

[1] Lebreton, *Origines*, 6th ed., p. 130, and Heinisch, *Die griechische Philosophie im Buche der Weisheit*, Münster, i.W., 1908. Cf. Pinard de la Boullaye, *L'Etude comparée des religions*, t. I., Paris, 1922, p. 475 *seq.*

[2] Lagrange, " *Vers le Logos de saint Jean* ", *RB*, 1923, pp. 326–327. Bertholet, *Bible. Theol. des A.T.*, II, pp. 482–483. Philo himself, the most Hellenistic of Jewish thinkers, is no more of an exception than those of his predecessors whose works have only reached us in a fragmentary condition. Certainly his allegorical exegesis by " bending the sacred text between his hands " poorly defended him against the temptation of finding all philosophy and all Greek mythology in the Law of Moses. " If he was checked on this slippery slope ", if his conception of God is purer, firmer, more religious than that of his Greek masters; if his God is a living God, not an abstract entity; if the Powers are for him less " absolute realities " and less secondary gods, than the visible reflections of the transcendant Being of the One God; if his Logos, despite fluctuations in his language, does not possess personal individuality and is only the first of the Powers, the most striking of the images which arrest the human eye, powerless to contemplate God in Himself, " this was by reason of his sincere attachment to his God, to his religion, and to his national traditions ": Lebreton, *Origines*, 6th ed., p. 184.

In other works produced by the Dispersion it is the apologetic side, defensive and (above all) offensive polemics, which is prominent, involving the annexation and use of " the riches of Egypt ", i.e. Greek literary forms and the terminology of fables, leading to a moral and allegorical interpretation of the Law (but is not even that apologetical ?). In this way the Jews who inspired the Jewish Sibyl in no way feared to present her as the " daughter of Circe and Glaucus ", and to associate the Titans and the Cronidae with the Biblical narratives concerning Babel. The author of *The Letter of Aristaeus* (200 B.C.) tried to persuade his royal correspondent that under different names, Zeus or Zeu, pagans and Jews adored the same sovereign God. In prose and in verse, and under cover of respected names, the Jewish apologists brought into prominence anything which brought their religion nearer to Greek wisdom, or even openly declared Moses and the Bible to be the origin of that wisdom; Orpheus, Sophocles, and Plato had to bear their testimony to the *anima naturaliter Judaica*. Their manner of life equally relaxed ; the connection with Jerusalem, despite pilgrimages and subsidies for the Temple became looser ; circumcision, as too onerous, was sometimes passed over in silence in apologetic works intended for the Gentiles. The ancient precepts of the natural law attributed to Noe were more willingly insisted upon.

To sum up, we have details of form, concessions of little importance, and temporary exemptions. When we have done justice to these, we are compelled to acknowledge that the foundations remained Jewish, that the Dispersed in Egypt, the most emancipated of all, remained firm believers in Jahveh and strict observers of the Law. The syncretistic features which appeared here and there were less compromises than facilities intended to make the approach to the religion of Israel less difficult for the Gentiles. " A Jew remains a Jew, and Josephus had good ground for declaring that no Jew was unfaithful to the Law. It is not the Jews who must become Greeks, but the Greeks, Jews ".[1]

---

[1] Bertholet, *Bibl. Theol. des. A.T.*, II, pp. 482–483.

Another very marked indication of the state of mind of the Dispersed in gospel times can be drawn from the religious attitude of Paul of Tarsus and that of the Jewish communities which he began to evangelize. These men spoke the Greek common in their day; they were in daily touch with affairs and with their pagan surroundings ; they profited by Roman tranquillity and availed themselves of the title of Roman citizen when they possessed it. Yet for the religion of their neighbours and their conquerors, what contempt, or rather what quiet disdain ! They spoke of a " worship of devils ", a " religion of nothingness " ; and they recalled, in opposition to this vile mythology, the Unknown God, the One God, the Living and Seeing God, whom inexcusable idolatry deprives of his due, while it precipitates those who adhere to that idolatry into an abyss of evils and of innumerable vices. They established, in moments of irony and indignation, a comparison between " the chalice of the Lord " and " the chalice of demons ", for " what the pagans offer in sacrifice, they immolate to demons, and not to God " (*I Cor.* x, 20). It is well to bring out all these characteristics, and we shall have to recall this unflinching attitude to those who would allot a part to important pagan infiltrations, not merely in the Judaism of the days of Christ upon earth, but also in the earliest Christian origins themselves.[1]

While it was general amongst the Jews, the state of mind we have just sketched naturally reached its zenith in Palestine. The solemn cult of the Temple, the presence of the most celebrated rabbis and the Pharisees in the midst of the people ; the indignant remembrance of the idolatrous pollutions which had contaminated the Holy City and even many Jews in the time of the Machabees ; the reaction and the hatred against the triumphant Gentiles and their odious symbols: all these contributed to arouse in souls an invincible estrangement from the superstition of the Nations.

---

[1] See Mangenot, *Saint Paul et les religions à mystères*, Paris, 1914; Krebs, *Das Religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Urchristentums*, Münster, 1913; Kennedy, *Saint Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, London, 1913. Loisy, that intellectual reflection of the radical exegesis of the moment, has taken up and completed certain ideas of Reitzenstein in the *R.H.L.R.*, 1913.

> " The facts reveal to us even better than their literature the people's profound hatred for idolatry. On the great gate of the Temple Herod had placed a golden eagle; the people threw it down. Pilate provoked a revolt by making his troops enter Jerusalem carrying the images of the emperors ; to avoid a similar rising Vitellius, when returning from Antioch to Petra, gave way to the demands of the Jews and made a wide circuit rather than pass through Palestine. And when Caligula wished to have his statue placed in the Temple at Jerusalem the popular feeling was such that Petronius, the governor of Syria, gave way ".[1]

Even the literature in which learned " comparativists " seek support, remains perfectly clear on essential points. Inspired or not, the works of certainly Palestinian origin which have come down to us from this time (200-1 B.C.) have this in common, that their authors were Jews of the strictest observance, much more on their guard against all foreign influence than were the prophets themselves, and that, whether they are historical like the first two books of *Machabees*, sapiential like the *Ecclesiasticus* of Jesus, son of Sirach, or the *Psalms of Solomon*, apocalyptic like the archaic parts of the *Book of Henoch* (xii-xxxvi, lxxxiii-cix ?, cx-cxi), the original foundation of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Book of the Jubilees*, and the *Apocalypse of Moses*, or sententious, like the most ancient maxims of *Pirké Aboth*, Israel occupies their whole horizon, or very nearly so ; with its historic tradition, interpreted according to a very particular method, and its destiny : trials, purifications, revenges and triumphs. The Gentiles hardly appear except as either the instrument or the object of the vengeance of Jahveh, his rod or the subject of his pitiless judgments. It is true that the sinners of Israel are denounced and threatened, but their fate is never confounded with that of the pagans.

The borrowings from Hellenism in this type of literature are insignificant, even as regards philosophy or literary form.

---

[2] Lebreton, *Origines*, 6th ed., p. 104.

Those traces which we can discover or reasonably suspect are due in fact to more ancient influences, Persian or Babylonian, dating from the time of the Captivity. They have to be sought chiefly in demonology and literature on the angels, possibly in the prominence given to the idea of two antagonistic kingdoms of light and darkness, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan.[1]

But these very signs of external influence, superficial and bearing upon details, bring out all the more the striking independence of the Jewish religion in its substance, and especially in Palestine. Never was the absolute, exclusive, and jealous transcendency of Jahveh more proudly affirmed than at this period, extending even to the correction of the sacred text containing the Divine Name, and to scruples as to pronouncing or writing it which led to the adoption of equivalent terms in alluding to it, terms which were thought more respectful, such as "the heavens", "the Blessed", etc.[2] Against this intransigent monotheism nothing could prevail : the opportunist efforts of Herod and his successors to introduce into Judaea certain timid forms of the imperial cult were totally fruitless. "On Palestinian soil", Bertholet remarks,[3] "this cult never exercised the least influence", though elsewhere it imposed itself on its rivals without difficulty, and very often supplanted them. That great saying of Jesus, by which he promulgated anew as the first and the greatest of the commandments the exclusive adoration and sovereign love of God, was the echo of the feelings of the entire Jewish race. But even more strikingly than this reply in which the Lord gathered up and made his own the holy heritage of Israel, his whole life and his profound and filial piety protested against the idea of including any pagan suggestions among the precedents that he accepted for his message.

---

[1] Frey, "*L'angélologie juive au temps de Jésus-Christ*", in the *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, 1911, pp. 75–110; Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul*, II, note *D.*, pp. 111–117, "*Le royaume de Satan*"; Smit, *De Daemoniacis in historia evangelica*, Rome, 1913, pp. 89–172. The most interesting texts for purposes of comparison are in the *Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte*, Lehmann and Haas, Leipzig, 1922, pp. 149–220 for Iranian texts, pp. 277–330 for Babylonian and Assyrian texts; Scheftelowitz, *Die altpersische Religion und das Judentum*, Giessen, 1920, reduces the real influence on *ancient* Judaism to a few texts.

[2] See the facts collected by W. Bousset in *Die Religion des Judentums* . . . 352 *seq.*

[3] *Theol. des A.T.*, pp. 360–361.

A last proof of this fact is supplied to us by the Master's very attitude in the presence of his enemies. The religious polemics of the greatest of the ancient prophets, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Zacharias, and Malachias, had oscillated, as regards their co-religionists, between two poles : these were fundamental reproaches addressed to the people as a whole, from which only a small body of elect, a " holy remnant ", seems to have been excepted, concerning on the one hand their negligence in the service of Jahveh, and their guilty attraction for foreign cults, an attraction which went so far as the commission of acts characterised as idolatry ; and on the other hand charging them with a formalism, a withering literalism, which placed the essentials of religion in exterior practices.

This last reproach,[1] which is very prominently stressed in the last part of *Isaias* (ch. lvi-lviii) and in the prophecy of *Zacharias* (ch. vii) is not absent even from *Ezechiel*, the very prophet who, in his vision of the Temple, pushed the care of forms and respect for ritual to its limits. But it is the other which occupies much the more prominent place with all the seers, and throughout the prophetic era. Yet it is true that with the passage of time the danger of idolatry seemed to grow less ; and *Malachias* chiefly reproaches his contemporaries (and in what terms !) with carelessness in the worship of Jahveh. The only passage directly aimed at attraction for foreign gods deals with the subject of mixed marriages which only too really involved this danger (*Mal.* ii, 10-11).

And if now we turn to the Gospels and examine what we may call the polemics of Christ, the general body of reproaches which he levelled at the Israelites of his time and at their religious guides, what do we see ? We find there no allusion to the danger of idolatry, no expression of grief corresponding to the invectives of the prophets against those who imperilled the purity and the unity of the worship due to Jahveh. The words of the Master are directed against the fanaticism, the literalism and even the hypocrisy of the leaders of the Pharisees. Not that the thoughts of Jesus were confined to Israel ; the Roman domination, the Egyptian kingdoms, and the fate of the Gentiles all found a place in it, as we shall see. But the danger confronting him was not an infiltration of pagan doctrines or religious customs, which were so powerful and so insidious in all other lands. There is no stronger support for the thesis here maintained.

---

[1] See thereon Touzard, " *L'Ame juive au temps des Perses*," *RB.*, 1923, pp. 66–79 and on Ezechiel, *RB*, 1919, pp. 71–88.

But we do not deny that some of these ideas, by their tendency, by the hopes they expressed, and by the aspirations to which they gave voice, came near to the expectation of Israel. This expectation was known far beyond the limits of Judaea and, through the Dispersed, something of it filtered through to the darkness of paganism. Apart from all questions of borrowings or imitation, the profound needs of the human soul uttered an overwhelming demand to which the divine offer was bound to respond. St. Paul reminds us that humanity (and the whole of creation) was then hesitatingly groping after, and from its confused desires crying out for, a liberator, a guide, a better life. Jesus willingly bore testimony to the good dispositions of certain Gentiles and contrasted them with the incredulity of the children of Abraham. But the disciple as well as the Master knew that salvation must come from Israel, and that, far from borrowing from the religious doctrines of the Nations, the Gospel was destined to be their light of salvation, and to open to them the only door which led to the Father.[1]

[1] Cf. d'Alès, *Lumen Vitae,* Paris, 1916.

# NOTE J

## SADDUCEES AND PHARISEES

These names have recently given rise to somewhat abstruse controversies. The expression *Pharisees* (*φαρισαῖοί*; in Aramaic, *perichaya*; in Hebrew, *peruchim*), means "the separated", "the sent away", and agrees very well with what we consider (following the researches of Lauterbach) the most probable origin of the party. Herr Kaufmann Köhler, on the other hand, argues for the meaning "separatists", seceders practising *ἀμιξία* (see *JE*, IX, p. 661).

In his work *Pharisäer und Sadduzäer* (Frankfort, 1912) Leszynski in order to explain the word *Pharisee* has recourse to the term *perach, to explain, to interpret* (cf. Bacher, *Die Exegetische Terminologie der Jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, Leipzig, 1905, I, p. 154 *seq.*; II, p. 165 *seq.*). According to that, therefore, *Pharisee* would mean *interpreter* and would first be used not of the whole party of those devoted to the Law, but of the group which wished to make oral tradition agree with the Law, and to base the former on the latter. That group, as we know, eventually triumphed about a century before our era.

However ingenious this theory may be, it comes to grief in face of the fact that "the form of the word *peruchim*, which is passive, does not lend itself easily to the meaning *interpreter*" (Box, *ERE*, IX, p. 832, B). Above all, it is a pure conjecture and one opposed to the ancient and traditional meaning of the word, as has been well brought out by Sieffert, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, *REP*, 3, XV, 281.

The name *Sadducee* presents a greater problem. Its origin has been sought in the appellation *zaddikim* ("the just"), but etymology is absolutely opposed to this theory. Others have speculated as to a Zadok or Zaduk as the possible initiator or leader of the aristocratic party, but this hypothesis is without foundations, no person of this name having left any serious trace on the history of that time, despite Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfaenge des Christentums*, Stuttgart, 1921-1923, I, pp. 290-291.

In his memoir *Sadducäer und Pharisäer* (1863), A. Geiger suggested as originator the priest Sadoc, sometimes spelt Sadduc, (Sieffert, *REP*³, XV, 282) who played a prominent part under David and Solomon (*III Kings*, i, ii). The majority of writers have rallied to this view, which is especially recommended by the celebrated passage of *Ezechiel*, xxiv on " the sons of Sadoc ". Without going so far as to adopt all that has been built up on this passage (see van Hoonacker, " *Les prêtres et les lévites dans le livre d'Ezéchiel* ", *RB*, 1899, p. 180 *seq.*, and E. Tobac, *Les Prophètes d'Israel*, Malines, 1921, II—III, p. 411 *seq.*), we must acknowledge that under this name the prophet designates the sacerdotal race *par excellence*. (On the Sadokite priests, and their importance during the Exile, see Kennett, " Israel ", *ERE*, VII, pp. 451-452, and Desnoyers, *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique de Toulouse*, 1925, pp. 66-67, and notes). The Hebrew version of *Ecclesiasticus*, li, 12, inserts a psalm of 14 stichs which, if it belongs to the authentic text, which is doubtful (see Peters, *Der . . . hebraeische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus*, Freiburg in B., 1902, p. 304 *seq.*) decides the question. There it is said :

> Praise him who causes to spring forth a Horn from the House of David,
> For his mercy is everlasting,
> Praise him who chooses a priest amongst *the sons of Sadoc*,
> For his mercy is everlasting.

From wherever comes the first application of the expression " Sadocites, sons of Sadoc (Saddok), Sadducees ", to the party which was recruited from the priestly caste and represented its principal tendencies, the name was natural, and we can understand how historians, without adhering as a certainty to the theory which it expresses, have come to rally almost unanimously to that hypothesis.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amongst the Catholic writers who have in recent times dealt with the whole of this matter, or the greater part of it, we may note as specially important: J. Lebreton, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, Paris, 1910 (6th ed., 1927), Books I and II (*Origines*); M. J. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, 150 *avant Jésus-Christ à* 200 *après Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1909 (Messianism); J. Felten, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, oder Judentum und Heidentum zur Zeit Christi und der Apostel*, Regensburg, 1910, 2 vols. (a work of importance, which goes beyond Schürer's book in geographical and chronological scope); L. Hackspill, *Étude sur le milieu religieux et intellectuel contemporain du Nouveau Testament*, in the *Revue Biblique*, October, 1900; April, July, 1901; January, 1902 (important articles); J. Touzard, *La Religion d'Israel*, Paris, 1915; St. Székely, *Bibliotheca Apocrypha*, Vol. I, Freiburg i. B., 1913.

In addition there may also be read with profit: B. Allo, *L'Evangile en face du syncretisme païen*, Paris, 1910; M. B. Schwalm, *La vie privée du peuple juif a l'époque de Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1910; E. Beurlier, *Le monde juif au temps de Jésus-Christ et des Apôtres*, Paris, 1900; Alb. Valensin, *Jésus-Christ et l'étude comparée des religions*, Paris, 1912; and the introductions, dissertations, etc., joined to their edition of the texts of that period by F. Martin, J. Viteau, etc.

Amongst the works of non-Catholic writers, indisputably the most important is that of Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des Judischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christ*, (the 3rd and 4th editions of the first volume appeard during 1901): Vol. I, Introduction and political history; Vol. II, 1907, internal conditions; and 1909, Vol. III, the Dispersion and Jewish literature. General tables for it appeared in 1911. There is an English translation of the second edition, which is far less complete. All who write on this period are indebted to Schürer.

Out of the great number of other books, the most useful seem to be: G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, I, Leipzig, 1898 (an authority on the Aramaic tongue); W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentliche Zeitalter*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1906 [3rd ed. by H. Gressmann, Tübingen, 1926]; also *Kyrios Christos, Geschichte des*

*Christusglaubens* . . ., Gottingen, 1913, [2nd ed., 1921], and *Jesus der Herr, Nachtraege und Auseinandersetzungen zu Kyrios Christos*, Göttingen, 1915, by the same author; W. Baldensperger, *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums*, Strasbourg, 1903: Paul Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, Tübingen, 1903; G. Hönnicke, *Das Judenchristentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1908; and especially Alfred Bertholet, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. II (the first is by B. Stade), Tübingen, 1911.

Of the works in English, that which most accurately deals with this period is the collection of lectures by W. Fairweather, *The Background of the Gospels, or Judaism in the period between the Old and the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1908. We should especially notice, along with V. H. Stanton's old but still useful book, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, Cambridge, 1886, the articles, introductions, and studies by R. H. Charles and F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, London, 1914. The important article by W. V. Hague, *The Eschatology of the Apocryphal Scriptures*, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, XII, 1911, pp. 57–98, is much influenced by the radical German school. S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity*, New York, 1915. W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha, their origin, teaching, and contents*, New York, 1914. [The most considerable book existing in the English language is now that of G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the first Centuries of the Christian Era*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2 vols., 1927. It is the fruit of great ability and great labour, but it has sometimes the tone of a defence rather than of a history.]

*La Palestine au temps de Jésus-Christ*, 5th ed., Paris, 1892, by the French Protestant professor, Edouard Stapfer, may still be read.

The chief texts bearing on this period are collected in careful translations in three collections, two of which are complete in themselves; the third, the work of Catholic authors, only contains non-canonical works and is composed of monographs dealing with each of these works.

1. *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, ed. by Emil Kautzsch, Tübingen, 2 vols., 1900. Vol. I contains the "apocrypha" (i.e., our deuterocanonical books), in addition to the 3rd Book of Esdras, the 3rd of Machabees, the Prayer of Manasses, and the Letter of Jeremias. Vol. II contains the apocalypses, with the 4th Book of Machabees, the Psalms of Solomon and a few legends.

2. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. by R. H. Charles, Oxford, 2 vols., 1913. The contents and

the distribution of the matter is almost the same as the above. The second volume of the English collection contains in addition the history of Ahikar, the *Pirké Aboth*, and the " Zadokite " fragments discovered by S. Schechter in 1910.

3. *Documents pour l'Étude de la Bible; Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament*, published under the direction of F. Martin. Of these, there have appeared between 1901 and 1911, *le livre d'Hénoch* (F. Martin); *Histoire et Sagesse d'Ahikar l'Assyrien* (F. Nau); *Ascension d'Isaïe* (E. Tisserant); and *les Psaumes de Salomon* (J. Viteau).

An imposing edition of the complete text of the *Mishna*, with German translation and commentary, began to appear at Giessen in 1912: *Die Mischna, Text, Ubersetzung und ausfuhrliche Erklaerung*, ed. by G. Beer and O. Holtzmann.

Concerning *foreign infiltrations*, in addition to the already-mentioned works by B. Allo, E. Mangenot, H. Pinard de la Boullaye, H. A. A. Kennedy, etc., we may draw attention to the researches of Carl Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklaerung des Neuen Testaments*, Giessen, 1909, 2nd ed., 1924 (English translation: *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Edinburgh, 1912), and *Der Einfluss des Mysterienreligionen auf das aelteste Christentum*, Giessen, 1913 (*RVV*, XIII, 1).

Compilations for Ancient Egypt have been made (with many arbitrary conjectures) by R. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religiongeschichtliche Fragen*, Strasbourg, 1901; *Poimandres*, Leipzig, 1904; the reader may also consult the clear-cut criticism of Engl. Krebs in the appendix to his monograph: *Der Logos als Heiland im ersten Jahrhundert*, Freiburg i. B., 1910. C. F. C. Heinrici (ed. by E. von Dobschütz), *Die Hermesmystik und das Neue Testament*, Leipzig, 1918.

For Assyria and Babylon: H. Zimmern and H. Winckler, 3rd ed. of Eb. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, Berlin, 1902, and Alf. Jeremias. Critical article *Babylone et la Bible*, in the *DAFC*, I, col. 327–390, by Alb. Condamin. Also P. Karge, *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament*, Münster, 1913.

For Iran and Persia, see, besides the works of James Darmesteter (especially the Preface to Vol. III of his translation of the Avesta, Paris, 1893), of J. H. Moulton, and of N. Soederblom, *La Vie future d'après le Mazdéisme*, Paris, 1901, the articles by Père Lagrange in the *DAFC*: *Iran* (*Religions de l'*), II, col. 1103–1135. See also *Christus*, Paris, 1921, ch. VI, by Albert Carnoy; *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, being Studies in Religious History from* 330 B.C. *to* A.D. 330, Cambridge, 2 vols., 1915, by F. Legge; and *Où en est l'Histoire des Religions?* by J. Labourt, Vol. I, Paris, 1911.

For Hellenism and Syro-Hellenic Syncretism, see Paul Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, Tübingen, 1913. This question is very well treated by J. Lebreton, *Origines*, 6th ed., Book I, pp. 1–99 and *passim.* See also St. von Dunin-Borkowski, *Hellenistischer Synkretismus und Christentum*, in the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, XCII, 1912, pp. 388 *seq.*, 520 *seq.* N. Fracassini, *Il misticismo greco e il cristianesimo*, Città di Castello, 1922. Cf. also *DTC*, VIII, 2, 1925, *Judaisme*, col. 1652–1668, by E. Dennefeld.

# GENERAL INDEX

# GENERAL INDEX

*Acts* of the Apostles, authenticity, 78–82; unity, 225–27; language and style, 79, 225–27
*Agrapha*, 18
Alexandria, Jewish colony, 13 n.2; 257–58; 293
Allegorism, Alexandrine, and the Fourth Gospel, 173 n.1
Alliance with God in the O.T., 282–83
*Alogi*, the, 184–86
*Am–ha'arez*, 185 n.1, 263 n.1, 272 n.1
Analogies, literary, with the Gospels, 41–7
Antichrists, in *John*, 161–62
Antilegomena, 18, 215, 218
*Apocalypse*, St. John's, 237; date, 237; language, 237–38; composition, 238–240; comparison with the Fourth Gospel, 242–47
Apocalyptic literature in the O.T., and Judaism, 277–80; 283–91; in the N.T., 237–47
Apollos, 52
Apologetics, Jewish, 295
Aramaic, 58 n.2, 106; spoken by Jesus, 106 n.2
Augustine, St., and the Synoptic fact, 93; 114 n.2

Bakti, personal devotion in India, 53 n.1
Baptism of John, 190; received by Jesus, 219; Christian, 174
Beatitudes, 55 n.2; 87 n.1
"Brothers of the Lord," 177
Buddha, worship of, 53 n.1
Buddhism, 53 n.1
Buddhist books, 53 n.1

*Canons* of Eusebius, 93
Catechesis, Apostolic, 28–9, 33–4, 101 n.1, 105–06, 107–08
Cerinthus, 162 n.3
Chasidim, sect of, 44–5
"Christ of history" and the "Christ o faith," 251–52
Chronology, Gospel, 4, 94, 99, 259; Pauline, 22–3, 71 n.1
Community, the primitive Christian, 43, 49, 52
Comparativist School, 41

Diaspora, 6, 23, 54, 107, 163, 253–62, 292–96
*Diatessaron*, Tatian's, 92, 133, 143
Dispersion, see Diaspora.
Docetae, 233 n.1
Doublets in the Gospels, 110–11

Ebionites, 86, 214, 217, 233
Education, Jewish, 184–85
Elephantine (Jewish Colony), 254, 293
End of the World, 283–91
*Ephesians*, Epistle to, its Pauline authenticity, 20, 221–22
Essenes, 264–65
Eucharist, Holy, 174

"Fearing God," 257
Folklore and the Gospels, 50

Gnosticism and Gnostics, 132–33, 137–38, 162 n.1, 3; 170
Gospels, canonical, their names, 35–6; the text, 36–8; literary character, 38–56; 82; dates of composition, 118, 228–33; their oral preparation, 104–6; liturgical character, 52; comparison with the Buddhist books and with the Koran, 53 n.1. See also *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*. Also "Historicity."

*Hebrews*, Epistle to the, its composition and recipients, 223; its historical value, 5, 223–24
Hellenism and the O.T., 293–95; and Judaism, 292–300; and the N.T., 54, 107

Hermetic writings, 164
Herod the Great, 3, 259–60; Antipas, 3, 190, 259, 260; Archelaus, 260; Agrippa I, 3, 264; Agrippa II, 3, 191
Herodians, 263
Herodias, 190
Historicity of the Gospels, Synoptic, 117–24; Johannine, 172–83
Holy Ghost, as witness to Jesus, 103–04; his gifts, 103–04
Humanity of Christ, 173, n.2
Hymns to Christ, 15

India, see Buddha.
Irenaeus, his testimony on the Tetramorphous Gospel, 228–33; on the Fourth Gospel, 133, 136–38

James of Jerusalem, 149, 191, 192, 219, 220
James, son of Zebedee, 145-48
Jesus Christ, See Logos.
Jews, meaning of the word in the Fourth Gospel, 171 n.2, 182
Joan of Arc, 27
John, son of Zebedee, his claim to martyrdom, 146–54
*John*, the Epistles of, 132, 160–61
*John*, the Gospel of, its traditional attestation, 130–41; its integrity, 143; literary unity, 155–60; its end, 160–63; its plan, 172; its historicity, 172–84; geographical accuracy 176–77; its realism, 173; its sacramentalism, 174–75; "ecclesiastical" character, 174; mysticism, 158–59; eschatology, 245–46; language and style, 157–58; 179–80; the hypothesis of an Aramaic original, 179; its Jewish colouring, 179–83; comparison with the Synoptics, 159–160; 174–75; 178; dependence on *Mark*, 160; connection with Philo, 164
John the Baptist, ministry, 4, 8; death, 190
Josephus and primitive Christianity, 7–8, 190–95
Judaism, in the Dispersion, 253–262; Palestinian, 262–75
Judgment of God, 285–86
Justice, legal, 171

Kingdom of God, or of Heaven, 60 n.3; in the O.T. and Judaism, 281–91. See also " End of the World."

*Koran*, 53 n.1

Language spoken by Jesus, 106 n.2
Life in *John*, 169, 171
Light, in *John* 170, 172
Logia, 18–19, 101 n.1, 218; in Papias, 57, 59 n.2
Logos, outside the N.T., 128 n.1, 164–65, 168; and Wisdom, 165–69; in the N.T., 163, 165–69, 245; independence as regards Philo, 164
*Luke*, Gospel of, 29, 36, 48; testimony of tradition, 77–82; style, 82, 89, 115; medical language, 89 n.2; plan, 84; characteristic features, 82–91; in relation to *Mark*, 111–12; to *Matthew*, 112–16; Paulinism, 90

Mahomet, 3, 53 n.1
*Makom*, 60 n.3, 272 n.2
Manichaeism, 170
*Mark*, Gospel of, 36, 48–49, 51, 59, 67–77; testimony of tradition, 68–71; date of composition, 70–2, 228–232; characteristic features, 72–7, 120, 175; connection with Peter, 68–70, 75, 76, 114; in relation to *Luke*, 111–12; to *Matthew*, 114–15
Mary, Mother of Jesus, 88–89
Martyrologies on the death of John the Apostle, 152-54
*Matthew*, Gospel of, 36, 48; testimony of tradition, 57–9; date of composition, 59, 228–232; characteristic features, 59–67, 114–17; relative priority, 114–15; in relation to *Mark* 114–15; to *Luke*, 112–13; language and style, 65–6, 114–16; connection with the *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews*, 217–220
*Memra*, 60 n.3, 164
Messiaship and Messias, the Jewish idea of it, 287–291; its echo amongst the pagans, 287; sufferings of the Messias, 291. See also " Prophecies."
Millenarianism, 285–86
Monotheism, in Judaism, 298–300
Mystics, Christian, 158–9, 27
Mythical hypotheses on Christ, 4, 9-10, 27 n.1

Nicolaitans, 162 n.3
Nirvana, 53 n.1
Noe, precepts of, 257, 295

*Oracles of the Lord*, 57, 59
Oral Style, 23, 54–5, 61–2, 107–09, 179–180, 203–213.
Orpheus, 4

Pagans, allusions to the history of Christ, 13–16
Palestine, extent, 260 n.1; population, 253; political condition, 259–262
Palestinian books, 297–300
Parallelism in the oral style, 207
Paul, his letters, 21–2; his career, 22–4; his style, 24–7, 221–23; his character, 22–3; his testimony to the historic Christ, 4, 27–35, 110 n.1; his agreement with the other disciples 124; his teaching on Christ, 30–34
Paulinism and the Gospels, 89–91, 116 n.4, 124
Persecutions against the Christians, 13–16
Peter, his primacy, 105; martyrdom at Rome, 71 n.1
Pharisees, origin of the name, 300; doctrines and tendencies, 266–275; legalism, 271–74; influence, 272–73; opposition to Jesus, 274
Prophecies, Messianic, 282–85, 291; their Jewish literal interpretation, 285–86
Proselytes, 256–57
Pythagoras and Pythagoreans, 43, 128 n.3

Q (source), 102, 113 n.1, 118

Rabbinical literature, 10–12, 268 n.2; method of teaching, 11, 203; devotion to the Law, 165; attitude towards Christ, 10–2
Riches in the N.T., 86–7
Rome, its Jewish colony, 7, 13; its Christian church, 13–4

Sadducees, 271; origin of the name, 301–02
Sadokite fragment, 270
Sanhedrin, 261
*Shekina*, 60 n.3
*Shema*, 254
Scribes in Israel, 254, 266–67
Servant of Jahveh, 291
Sociological School, 196–202
Sources of the Gospels, oral, 100–01; written, 101–02, 109–12; theory of Two Sources, 101–05
Stoics, 168
Symbolic explanation of the fourth Gospel, 127–28
Synagogues, 254–55
Syncretism, pagan, and Judaism, 295–96

Talmud and the history of Christ, 10–11
Teaching, oral, amongst the Jews, 11, 54, 205
Temples, Jewish, 253, 254
Testament, Old and New, origin of the word, 20 n.2
Tetramorphous Gospel, 19, 92. See "Gospels, Canonical."
Text of the N.T., 37–8
Tradition of the Gospel, oral, 100–01, 109–10
Truth, in *John*, 168–70

Universalism, Christian, 64
*Urmarkus*, 102 n.2

Women in the Gospels, 88–9
Word of God. See Logos.
Worship, Christian, 51, 108

Zealots, 263–64

N.B.—Most of the above subjects are further discussed in Vols. II and III.

# INDEX OF NAMES

# INDEX OF NAMES

Abbott, E. A., 157, 237
Abrahams, I., 180, 261, 277, 281
*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 150
*Acts of John* (apocryphal), 150
Albertz, M., 142
Albright, 179
Alès, A. d', 14, 80, 171, 300
Alexander of Alexandria, St., 167
Allen, C. W., 62, 106, 113
Allo, B., 165, 168, 237, 239, 240, 242, 245, 305, 307
Amann, E., 216
Ambrose, St., 167
Ammon, C. F. von, 125
Ammonius, 92
Andresen, G., 14
Angus, S., 306
*Apocalypse of Moses*, 297
Apollinarius of Hierapolis, 132
Apollinarius of Laodicea, 216
Apollonius, 132
Apollonius of Tyana, 41, 128
*Apophthegmata Patrum*, 44
Appasamy, A. J., 47
*Ascension of Isaias*, 307
*Assumption of Moses*, 288
Athanasius, St., 167
Athenagoras, 132
Augustine, St., 33, 58, 93, 167, 173, 251

Bacher, W., 10, 292, 301
Baldensperger, G., 5
Baldensperger, W., 287, 306
Bardenhewer, O., 141
Bardy, G., 162, 194
Barnes, W. Emery, 9, 194
*Baruch, Apocalypse of*, 288
Basset, H., 55, 208
Batiffol, P., 9, 13, 14, 102, 192, 194
Baudin, E., 168
Bauer, W., 17, 143, 144, 156, 158, 164, 176, 179, 181, 183
Baur, F. C., 118, 127, 221, 222
Bell, H. I., 13
Belser, J., 171, 183, 230
Berendts, A., 193
Bergh van Eysinga, G. A., 22
Bernard, St., 27, 158
Bertholet, A., 291, 293, 294, 295, 298
Bertram, G., 42
Beurlier, A., 305
Böhlig, R., 25
Böhmer, J., 281, 282
Bonsirven, J., 282
Bouglé, C., 199
Bourguet, E., 22
Bousset, W., 42, 44, 48, 123, 222, 234, 237, 241, 291, 298, 305
Bover, J. M., 171
Box, G. H., 10, 268, 273, 301
Brassac, A., 23
Bréhier, E., 294
Breitschneider, C. T., 125
Brière, Y. de la, 279
Brooke, A. E., 133
Bruno d'Asti, 68
Buber, M., 45
Buchanan, E. S., 81, 136
Büchler, A., 261
Bultmann, R., 25, 42, 44, 51, 62, 105, 128, 147, 165, 175, 199
Burkitt, F. C., 9, 20, 85, 92, 173, 194, 306
Burney, C. F., 131, 149, 168, 179, 204, 234, 235, 243
Burton and Goodspeed, 93, 95, 99
Bury, J. B., 46
Butler, Abbot C., 44
Buttenwieser, M., 291

Cadbury, H. J., 83, 89, 226
Caius, 134, 188
Camerlynck, A., 93, 102, 231
Cantarelli, L., 23
Carnoy, A., 307
Carpenter, J. E., 127
Causse, A., 263

Cavallera, F., 115, 232
Cerinthus, 162
Chapman, Abbot J., 100–01, 141, 204, 230, 231
Charles, R. H., 11, 149, 154, 165, 169, 234, 237, 239, 240, 241, 270, 272, 287, 288, 291, 306
Cheikho, L., 209
Chénier, A., 55
Cicero 255
Cladder, H., 38, 58, 63, 111, 163, 203
Cleanthes, 25
Clemen, C., 307
Clement of Alexandria, 20, 56, 69–71, 132, 134, 135, 167, 210, 214, 247
Clement of Rome, St., 51, 224
*Codex Bezae*, 19
Colin, J., 23
Colson, F. H., 83
Condamin, A., 35, 203, 205, 291, 307
Conrad, J., 180
Coppieters, C., 221
Cornelius a Lapide, 94, 282
Cornely, R., 228
Cornely and Zorell, 281
Corssen, P., 14, 195
Couchoud, P. L., 27
Cyril of Alexandria, St., 167
Cyril of Jerusalem, St., 167
Cuthbert, Fr., O.S.F.C., 186
Czarnowski, G., 46

Dalman, G., 42, 60, 106, 277, 281, 282, 287, 291, 305
Dante, 86
Darmesteter, J., 307
Deissmann, A., 21, 23, 35, 41, 79, 104, 106, 129, 187, 221, 222, 237
Delafosse, H., 130
Delatte, A., 128, 143
Delehaye, H., 50, 52, 74, 137, 154
Delff, H., 146, 234–236
Dennefeld, E., 308
Denys bar Salibi, 136
Denys of Alexandria, 141, 153, 157, 239, 244
Deploige, S., 199
Desnoyers, L., 302
Dibelius, M., 42, 44, 51, 65, 128, 175
*Didache*, 51
Didymus, 18
Dieterich, A., 242
Dix, G. H., 291
Dobschütz, E. von, 62, 257
Dodwell & Harvey, 138
Drummond, J., 171
Duchesne, L., 52, 71, 153
Dufourcq, A., 50
Dunin-Borkowski, S. von, 308
Durkheim, E., 196–201

Edersheim, A., 185
Eichhorn, J. G., 93
Eisler, Rob., 194
Ephraem, St., 58, 167, 217
Epiphanius, St., 58, 133, 135, 214, 217
*Esdras* (IV), 286
Estienne, R., 36
Eusebius, 16, 19, 29, 43, 56, 57, 58, 59, 68, 69, 82, 92, 103, 107, 121, 134, 136, 137, 139, 153, 157, 193, 214, 216, 218, 238, 239, 264
Evansers, E., 125

Fairweather, W., 306
Farmer, G., 185
Faye, E. de, 136
Feine, P., 89
Felder, H., 195
Felton, J., 290
Fiebig, P., 42, 101
Fonck, L., 115
Foucauld, C. de, 55, 208
Fracassini, N., 308
*Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, 270
Frame, J. E., 21
Francis of Assisi, St., 158, 186
Freind, J., 89
Frey, J. B., 171, 270, 298
Fries, S. A., 253, 293

Gardner, P., 153
Gaster, M., 45
Geffcken, J., 258
Geiger, A., 302
George Hamartolus, 152, 153
Giscala, John of, 195
Goguel, M., 102, 125, 129
Gölzer, H., 14
*Gospel of the Ebionites*, 19, 217
*Gospel of the Egyptians*, 19
*Gospel according to the Hebrews*, 19, 52, 214–220
*Gospel of Peter*, 19, 52
*Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*, 217
Graffin, R., 153
Gregory of Nyssa, St., 154
Grenfell & Hunt, 37
Gressmann, H., 42
Griesbach, J., 56, 93
Gunkel, H., 41, 42, 242

Hackspill, L., 305
Hague, W. V., 306
Hamartolus, see George
Handmann, R., 215
Harnack, A. von, 9, 14, 16, 19, 20, 71, 78, 79, 80, 89, 90, 110, 112, 113, 115, 118, 124, 131, 133, 140, 164, 194, 221, 225, 230, 244, 265
Harris, J. R., 36, 108, 131, 165,
Harris and Mingana, 131
Hawkins, Sir J., 78, 100, 112, 113, 225
Hegesippus, 220
Heiler, F., 47, 252
Heinisch, P., 294
Heinrici, G., 42, 307
Heitmüller, W., 132, 145, 147, 148, 153, 154, 192
*Henoch, Book of*, 169, 252, 286, 288, 297, 307
Heracleon, 132, 133, 188
Heraclitus, 168
Herder, 93
Herford, R. T., 268, 272
Hermas, 239
Hilary, St., 167
Hilgenfeld, 221
Hippolytus, St., 72, 136, 134
*Historia Apostolica* (*Abdias*), 150
*History and Wisdom of Ahikar*, 307
Hobart, W. K., 89
Hoennicke, G., 306
Hoh, J., 20, 228, 231
Holl, K., 133, 135
Holtzmann, H. J., 33, 34, 45, 87, 89, 161, 167, 173, 180, 181, 221
Hoonacker, A. van, 291, 293, 302
Hopkins, E. W., 257
Horn, G., 142
Horner, 38
Hort, F. J. A., 38
Hügel, Baron F. von, 158

Iamblicus, 143
Ignatius of Antioch, St., 59, 130, 157, 219, 222, 223
Irenaeus, St., 20, 57, 58, 59, 69, 70, 71, 77, 80, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 162, 168, 188, 214, 221–223, 238, 247

Jackson & Lake, 123, 194
Jacobs, J., 13
Jacquier, E., 223
Jalabert, L., 23
James, R., 17, 150, 216
Jeremias, A., 307
Jerome, St., 58, 117, 135, 167, 214, 216, 218, 219
Jerphanion, G. de, 17
John Chrysostom, St., 58, 151, 167, 183
John of the Cross, St., 167
Jörgensen, J., 186
Josephus, 8, 9, 186, 189–195, 253, 259, 264, 267, 273, 276, 287
Jousse, M., 55, 204, 207, sqq.
*Jubilees, Book of*, 288, 297
Jülicher, A., 22, 45, 87, 98, 181
Juster, J., 191, 255, 256
Justin, St., 11, 16, 36, 42, 80, 108, 133, 188, 247
Justus of Tiberias, 8, 192, 195

Karge, P., 282, 307
Kattenbusch, F., 131
Kautsky, 87
Kennedy, H. A., 296, 307
Kennett, R. H., 302
Kirch, C., 14
Klausner, J., 8, 123, 291
Klostermann, E., 35, 78
Knabenbauer, J., 183
Knopf, R., 72
Kohler, K., 13, 24, 263
*Koran*, 53
Köster, F. B., 203
Krauss, S., 13, 195
Krebs, E., 296, 307
Krüger, G., 131
Krumbacher, K., 152

Labourt, J., 307
Labourt & Batiffol, 131
Labriolle, P. de, 135
Lagrange, M. J., 9, 12, 14, 35, 37, 57, 58, 65, 77, 78, 81, 83, 84, 87, 89, 92, 99, 102, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116, 130, 131, 138, 139, 140, 143, 146, 149, 156, 157, 164, 167, 171, 176, 177, 179, 183, 187, 215, 216, 218, 257, 277, 281, 282, 287, 291, 294, 305, 307
Lagrange & Lavergne, C., 93
Lammens, H., 53
Lanchester, N. C. O., 258
Laqueur, R., 194
Larfeld, W., 93
Lasserre, P., 164
Lattey, C. F., 179
Lauterbach, J. Z., 261, 268, 301
Lebreton, J., 164, 165, 167, 169, 216, 294, 297, 305, 308

Legge, F., 307
Legouis & Cazamian, 180
Lepin, M., 126, 141, 142, 176
Lessing, 93, 216
Leszynski, R., 301
*Letter of Aristaeus*, 295
Leucius Charinus, 150
Levesque, E., 94, 111
Lichtenberger, H., 45
Lietzmann, H., 41, 71, 237
Lightfoot, J. B., 71, 77
Loeb, I., 12, 263
*Logia*, 18, 19, 218
Lohmeyer, E., 237
Loisy, A., 23, 24, 79, 87, 122, 127, 129, 142, 144, 155, 156, 164, 168, 174, 183, 188, 199, 204, 209, 223, 224, 225, 226, 237, 240, 243, 296
Loofs, F. 178
Lütgert, W., 171
Luther, 90, 125

Machen, J. G., 28, 35, 124
MacNeile, A. H., 57
Mahomet, see *Koran*
Maimonides, 10
Maldonatus, 67, 94
Mâle, E., 17
Mangenot, E., 102, 296, 307,
Marcion, 19, 80, 90, 132, 133, 140, 188, 221, 230
Mariès, L., 204
Martin, F., 305
Massuet, 228
Melito of Sardis, 20, 132
Meyer, A., 12
Meyer, Ed., 48, 143, 146, 192, 302
Milligan, G., 21
*Mishna*, 10, 268, 307
Moffatt, J., 60, 125, 178, 253
Mommsen, T., 139
Monnier, H., 119
Montanus, 133, 188
Montefiore, C. G., 281
Moore, G. F., 165, 185, 306
Morin, Dom G., 68
Moss, R. W., 254
Moulton, J. H., 25, 41, 65, 79, 82, 106, 225, 237, 307
Moulton & Milligan, 171
Müller, D. H., 203
*Muratorian Canon*, 77, 81, 132, 136
Murry, J. M., 119

Nestle, E., 56
Nicephorus, 215, 218
Nicephorus Callistus, 85
Niese, B., 9, 190, 192
Nietzsche, F., 252
Noeldeke-Schwally, 53
Norden, E., 25, 42, 192

Ochser, S., 267
*Odes of Solomon*, 131, 157
Oesterley, W. O. E., 10, 306
Olivieri, Dom, 156
*Oracles*, see *Sibylline*
Origen, 11, 58, 151, 152, 167, 173, 192, 214-218, 247
Otto, R., 158, 197
Otto, W., 259, 260, 263

Palladius, 44
Papias, 29, 43, 57, 58, 59, 68, 107, 121, 139-141, 147, 152, 214
Papini, G., 86
Pauly, J. de, 45
Pérennès, H., 210
Peters, N., 302
Philip of Sidon, 152
Philo, 3, 128, 164, 257, 258, 264, 276, 287, 294
Philostratus, 41, 128
Photius, 8
Pinard de la Boullaye, H., 294, 307
Pindar, 82
Pionius, Pseudo-, 137
*Pirké Aboth*, 11, 60, 205, 272, 273, 277, 297
Pirot, L., 77
Plato, 41, 137
Pliny the Elder, 264
Pliny the Younger, 14, 15, 16
Plotinus, 41
Plummer, A., 33, 62, 85, 86, 89, 98
Polycarp, St., 131, 188, 221
Polycrates of Ephesus, 132
Porphyrius, 43
Poussin, L. de la Vallée, 53, 205
Prat, F., 22, 23, 25, 30, 32, 33, 71, 90, 124, 173, 223, 259, 298
Preuschen, E., 13, 215
Proclus, 41
*Psalms of Solomon*, 290, 306
Ptolemy, 132, 133, 188

Ramsay, W., 24, 77, 241
Redpath, H. A., 258
Reinach, A. J., 22
Reinach, S., 194
Reinach, T., 7, 9, 191, 256

Reitzenstein, R., 42, 296, 307
Renan, E., 5, 9, 13, 27, 40, 51, 68, 77, 86, 118, 126, 176, 177, 180, 216, 264, 267
Reuss, Ed., 9
Réville, J., 127, 129, 142
Robertson, A. T., 106
Rose, H. J., 25
Rousselot, P., 168
Rufinus, 59

Sabatier, A., 90
Sanday, W., 34, 100, 253
Sanday, Souter & Turner, 20, 228
Saulcy, F. de, 260
Schanz, 167
Scheftelowitz, G., 298
Schlatter, A., 180
Schleiermacher, F., 93, 102
Schmidt, C., 137
Schmidt, K. L., 42, 43, 45, 48, 49, 94, 129, 173, 199
Schmidt, W., 204
Schmidtke, A., 215–218
Schmiedel, P. W., 176
Schrader, E., 307
Schulthess, 106
Schürer, E., 9, 191, 193, 225, 226, 255, 257, 259, 261, 265, 280, 305
Schütz, R., 37
Schwalm, M. B., 185, 305,
Schwartz, E., 23, 58, 132, 137, 142, 147, 149, 151, 154, 155, 156
Schweitzer, A., 125
Séché, A., 17
*Sentences of the Fathers*, see *Pirké Aboth*
Shammai, 11
*Shemone Esre*, 277
*Sibylline Oracles*, 258, 288
Sickenberger, J., 102
Sieffert, 266, 302
Sievers, E., 22
Slijpen, A., 194
Smit, J., 298
Smith, D., 185
Smith, G. A., 203, 261
Soden, H. von, 167
Söderblom, N., 307
Soiron, T., 94, 101
Staehelin, F., 256
Staehlin, E. O., 70
Stamouli, A. A., 265
Stanton, V. H., 78, 99, 108, 120, 225, 226, 306
Stapfer, E., 277, 306
Strack, H. L., 10, 11, 42, 254, 261
Strack & Billerbeck, 60, 116, 165, 180, 277, 280, 291
Strauss, D. F., 4, 118
Streeter, B. H., 38, 47, 57, 98, 113, 114, 116, 149, 156, 160, 245
Swete, H. B., 67, 71, 75, 76, 103, 114, 234, 241
Székely, S., 305

Tacitus, 14, 287
Tagore, Rabindranath, 179
*Talmud*, 10, 269
Tatian, 92, 132, 133, 143, 188
Taylor, R. B., 265
Teresa, of Avila, St., 27, 158
Tertullian, 11, 20, 36, 132, 134, 137, 150, 168, 223, 247, 259
*Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 288 291, 297
Thackeray, St. J., 258
Tharaud, J., 45
Theodore the Reader, 85
Theophilus of Antioch, 132
Tillmann, F. R., 102
Tobac, E., 302
*Toledoth Jeshu*, 12
Torrey, M.C.C., 179
Touzard, J., 267, 282, 283, 291, 293, 299, 305
Tricot, A., 194
Troeltsch, E., 87
Turner, C. H., 73, 74, 120

Vaganay, L., 18
Valensin, Alb., 305
Valentinus, 132, 233
Vannutelli, P., 106
Vénard, L., 163
Vincent, H., 267
Vischer, 244
Viteau, J., 307
Vogels, H. J., 92, 167, 237, 244
Völter, 242
Volz, P., 282, 284, 287, 306
Vosté, J. M., 221

Walker, J. K., 89, 280
*We* sections, 78, 79
Weber, 280
Weinel, H., 158
Weiss, J., 22, 24, 28, 33, 42, 43, 73, 75, 76, 108, 116, 121, 130, 147, 155, 158, 175, 223, 255, 275, 291
Weizsaecker, C., 126
Wellhausen, J., 42, 147, 149, 155

Wendland, P., 41, 74, 175, 188, 308
Wendt, H. H., 161
Westcott, B. F., 38, 73, 161
Wette, de, 126
White, H. G. E., 19
Wieger, L., 275
Wikenhauser, A., 4, 77, 84
Wilcken, 16
Winckler, H., 307
Windisch, H., 128, 226
Wright, A., 100
Wrzól, J., 21
Wundt, W., 195

Xenophon, 41, 43, 146

Zahn, T., 36, 43, 93, 141, 143, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 167, 215, 217, 237, 241
Zenner, J. K., 203
Zimmern, H., 307
*Zohar*, 45

# The Roman Answer

JESUS CHRIST: HIS PERSON, HIS MESSAGE, HIS CREDE TIALS. *By Léonce de Grandmaison, S. J. Volume* *The Macmillan Company,* $4.50.

MANY Protestants suppose that Roman Catholics a carefully insulated from all books that do not bear tl sign "nihil obstat." This monumental work on Jesus, hov ever, reviews even the most radical scholarship and provid a distinct contrast to many Protestant works which assum that Roman Catholic writings may be ignored. Fathe Grandmaison left the completed work on his death in 1927 The second volume of the English translation now appears For careful study of the original sources and a comprehensiv survey of all important modern literature it leaves nothing t be desired. Detailed problems are discussed in detached note so that the text affords a succinct narrative for the reader wh is willing to think seriously with the author. *

* He does not pretend to write a "life of Jesus" any more than do the liberal Protestant scholars whose errors he would correct. Rather, he has the objective of substantiating the Catholic dogma as set forth in the formula of Calcedon. The first volume, appearing in 1930, was devoted entirely to a discussion of the sources and the gospel setting. Father Grandmaison is quite aware of the fact that the real battle is to be fought on the evaluation of the sources. He defends the four canonical gospels as apostolic. Matthew was the earliest, written in Aramaic, and later translated by an author whose language is influenced by Mark. He grants that there must be a literary solution of the synoptic problems. The Fourth Gospel is defended as from the son of Zebedee in a compact chapter surveying all modern study up to the time of the author's death. Nevertheless, when he comes to the message of Jesus, the material from John is usually used separately.

The volume before us contains Book III, Jesus, His Message, and Book IV, His Person. After discussions of the Father, his kingdom, and the commandment of love, the author proceeds to his main task. Through a masterful series of chapters he leads up to the conclusion of the self-witness to the divine nature and authority of Jesus. Relatively little is made of the argument from miracle. It is to his religious preeminence that Grandmaison makes appeal. What divides him from liberal critics is the confident assumption that the high faith of the gospels expresses exact words from the lifetime of Jesus rather than the faith of the generation that wrote the gospels.

The last 100 pages are given over to a survey of attitudes toward Jesus. Liberal readers have held up to them the contradictions and inadequacies of mediating Christologies. Few conservative Protestants, however, are likely to relish what is set forth as the true solution of the mystery of Jesus. After surveying the kenoticism of Bishop Gore and such conservative Christologies as those of Seeberg and Kaehler, he comes back: "The Catholic, or rather Christian, attitude towards the problem knows nothing of these hesitations, and refuses to make void, to obscure, or annul the mystery of Christ; it holds and proclaims that the union of two elements, two distinct principles of action, two 'natures'—the divine and the human—in one and the same person preexistent as such, is a mystery which passes the mind of man. There can therefore be no question of directly justifying the doctrine of the incarnation, of showing it to be intrinsically the only true one. The ultimate conclusion, for religion, to which this work points is unconditional dependence on Jesus of Nazareth, Lord and Son of God. One step further brings us to the Christian Catholic church, the depository and interpreter of the authentic teach-